UH 511-816-95
OHSTPY-HEP-E-95-010
February 1, 2008

B Mesons

Thomas E. Browder
University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, Hawaii 96822

Klaus Honscheid
Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio 43210

arXiv:hep-ph/9503414v1 22 Mar 1995

Abstract

B mesons are bound states of a b quark and a light anti-quark. While the binding is provided by the strong interaction B mesons can only decay by the weak interaction. Since the top quark mass is large, B mesons are the only mesons containing quarks of the third generation and thus their decays provide a unique opportunity to measure the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) matrix elements V_{cb}, V_{ub}, V_{ts}, and V_{td} which describe the couplings of the third generation of quarks to the lighter quarks.

We review experimental results on masses, lifetimes and decays of B mesons. These include measurements of the inclusive production of charmed and non-charmed mesons and baryons, observations of semileptonic B decays, $B - \bar{B}$ mixing, B meson lifetimes, measurements of exclusive hadronic final states with charmed mesons, the search for exclusive hadronic final states without charmed mesons, the first observation of the decay $B \to K^*\gamma$ which is described by an electromagnetic penguin diagram and measurement of the inclusive $b \to s\gamma$ rate. The theoretical implications of these results will be considered.

Contents

I INTRODUCTION **5**
A Hadronic and Semileptonic B Decays . . . 6
B Rare B Decays . . . 8

II THE EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF B DECAY **9**
A $\Upsilon(4S)$ Experiments . . . 9
1 Continuum Background Suppression . . . 11
2 Selection of B Candidates . . . 12
3 Background Studies . . . 14
B High Energy Collider Experiments . . . 14
C Determination of Average B Meson Branching Fractions . . . 16

III B MESON MASSES AND LIFETIMES **18**
A $\bar{B}^0$ and B^- Masses. . . . 20
B Measurement of the B^* Mass . . . 21
C Observation of B^{**} Production . . . 21
D Measurement of the B_s Mass . . . 22
E b-Baryon Masses . . . 23
F Techniques of b Lifetime Measurements . . . 24
1 Selection of an enriched b sample . . . 24
2 Impact parameter method . . . 25
3 Decay length measurements . . . 26
4 Averaging lifetime measurements . . . 26
G Inclusive b Lifetime . . . 26
H Exclusive Lifetime Measurements . . . 28
1 B^- and $\bar{B}^0$ lifetimes . . . 28
2 B_s lifetime measurements . . . 29
3 b baryon lifetime measurements . . . 30
4 Lifetime Ratios . . . 31
I Lifetime Summary . . . 32

IV SEMILEPTONIC B MESON DECAYS **33**
A Inclusive Semileptonic b→ c Transitions . . . 33
1 Measurements of $\mathcal{B}_{sl}$ on the $\Upsilon(4S)$ . . . 34
2 The semileptonic branching fractions of the B^- and $\bar{B}^0$ mesons . . . 37
3 Measurements of $\mathcal{B}_{sl}$ on the Z^0 Resonance . . . 38
4 Measurement of $b \to X\tau\nu$ . . . 39
B Exclusive Semileptonic Transitions. . . . 39
1 Measurements of $\mathcal{B}(B \to D^*\ell\nu)$ . . . 40
2 Measurements of $\mathcal{B}(B \to D\ell\nu)$ . . . 42
3 Measurements of $\mathcal{B}(B \to D^{**}\ell\nu)$ . . . 43
4 Summary of exclusive semileptonic $b \to c$ measurements . . . 45
C The Dynamics of Semileptonic B Decay . . . 46

1 Polarization in $B \to D^* \ell \nu$ decays . . . 47
2 Measurement of the $B \to D^* \ell \nu$ Form Factors . . . 47
D Determination of $|V_{cb}|$ . . . 50
1 $|V_{cb}|$ from inclusive measurements . . . 50
2 $|V_{cb}|$ from exclusive measurements . . . 51
3 Determination of $|V_{cb}|$ using HQET . . . 52
E $b \to u$ Transitions and $|V_{ub}|$ . . . 54
1 Inclusive Semileptonic $b \to u$ Transitions. . . . 56
2 Exclusive Semileptonic $b \to u$ Transitions . . . 58
3 Observation of $B \to \pi \ell \nu$ Transitions . . . 59
4 Prospects for the Determination of $|V_{ub}|$. . . . 59

V $B - \bar{B}$ MIXING 62
A $B_d - \bar{B}_d$ Mixing . . . 65
B $B_s - \bar{B}_s$ Mixing . . . 67

VI INCLUSIVE B DECAY 69
A Motivation . . . 69
B Inclusive B Decay to Mesons . . . 70
C Inclusive B Decay to Baryons . . . 74
D Charm Production in B Decay . . . 79

VII EXCLUSIVE B DECAY TO BARYONS 82

VIII EXCLUSIVE B DECAY TO D MESONS 82
A Measurements of $D(n\pi)^-$ Final States . . . 82
B Measurements of $D^*(n\pi)^-$ Final States . . . 82
C Polarization in $B \to D^{*+} \rho^-$ Decays . . . 85
D Measurements of D^{**} Final States . . . 87
E Exclusive Decays to D and D_s Mesons . . . 89

IX COLOR SUPPRESSED B DECAY 89
A Exclusive B Decays to Charmonium . . . 89
B Polarization in $B \to \psi K^*$ . . . 91
C Exclusive Decays to a $D^{0(*)}$ and a Neutral Meson. . . . 92

X THEORETICAL INTERPRETATION OF HADRONIC B DECAY 98
A Introduction . . . 98
B Factorization . . . 99
C Phenomenological Models of Hadronic B Decay . . . 99
D Heavy Quark Effective Theory . . . 100

XI TESTS OF THE FACTORIZATION HYPOTHESIS 100
A Branching Ratio Tests . . . 100
B Factorization and Angular Correlations . . . 103
C Tests of Spin Symmetry in HQET . . . 104

D Applications of Factorization . . . 105
E Factorization in Color Suppressed Decay . . . 106

XII DETERMINATION OF THE COLOR SUPPRESSED AMPLITUDE 107
A Color Suppression in B Decay . . . 107
B Determination of $|a_1|$, $|a_2|$ and the Relative Sign of (a_2/a_1) . . . 108
C The Sign of a_2/a_1 and the Anomalous Semileptonic Branching Ratio . . . 111

XIII RARE HADRONIC DECAYS 113
A Decays to D_s Mesons . . . 114
B Charmless Hadronic B Decay . . . 114
C New Experimental Results on $\bar{B}^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$ and $\bar{B}^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ . . . 116
D Inclusive/Semi-Inclusive $b \to sg$ transitions . . . 118

XIV ELECTROMAGNETIC PENGUIN DECAYS 119
A Observation of $B \to K^*(892)\gamma$ . . . 119
B Search for exclusive $b \to d\gamma$ transitions . . . 120
C Experimental Constraints on the $b \to s\gamma$ Inclusive Rate . . . 120
D Theoretical Implications of $b \to s\gamma$ . . . 121
E $b \to s\ell^+\ell^-$ Decays . . . 122

XV PURELY LEPTONIC B DECAY 123
A B Decays to Two Leptons . . . 124
B The Decays $B \to \tau\nu$, $B \to \mu\nu$ and $B \to e\nu$. . . . 125

XVI CONSTRAINTS ON THE CKM MATRIX 126
A Introduction . . . 126
B The CKM element $|V_{cb}|$ . . . 126
C The CKM element $|V_{ub}|$ . . . 128
D The CKM element $|V_{td}|$ . . . 129
E The CKM element $|V_{ts}|$ . . . 129
F The ratio $|V_{ts}/V_{td}|$ . . . 130
G CP Violation . . . 131

XVII CONCLUSIONS 132

REFERENCES 135

APPENDIX 148

I. INTRODUCTION

One intriguing puzzle in physics is the regular pattern of the three fermion and quark families. The existence of families gives rise to many of the free parameters of the Standard Model, in particular the fermion masses and the elements of the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa matrix (CKM) [1] that describe the mixing between the quark generations. The determination of all of these parameters is required to fully define the Standard Model and may also reveal an underlying structure that will point to new physics. In the Standard Model of three generations the CKM matrix is defined by three real parameters and one complex phase. It relates the eigenstates of the strong and weak interactions and can be written

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\ V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\ V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix} \tag{1}$$

The matrix V can be expressed approximately as

$$\simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1-\lambda^2/2 & \lambda & A\lambda^3(\rho - i\eta) \\ -\lambda & 1-\lambda^2/2 & A\lambda^2 \\ A\lambda^3(1-\rho-i\eta) & -A\lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + O(\lambda^4) \tag{2}$$

This empirical parameterization, suggested by Wolfenstein [2], is correct to terms of order λ^4 with $\lambda = \sin\theta_{Cabibbo} \approx 0.22$. In the case of the two generations, the matrix V is a simple rotation matrix where $\theta_{Cabibbo}$ is the angle of rotation. For three generations, V may contain complex elements and allows for CP violation if the parameter η is non-zero. Although readily accommodated in the Standard Model, CP violation remains one of the least well understood phenomena in physics. So far it has only been observed in the decays of kaons. While the results from the kaon sector are consistent with the Standard Model, the complications introduced by strong interaction effects make it nearly impossible to ascertain whether the complex CKM phase is the sole source for the observed asymmetries.

The only other observational constraint on CP violation comes from cosmology. As was first noted by Sakharov, there is an important connection between the observed baryon asymmetry in the universe and CP violation in fundamental processes [3]. He postulated that CP violation in fundamental processes in the early universe, C and baryon number violation, and the absence of thermal equilibrium gave rise to the observed baryon asymmetry. However, recent work suggests that the Standard Model and the complex phase in the CKM matrix cannot provide sufficient CP violation to account for the magnitude of the baryon asymmetry so that other sources of CP violation must be present [4]. An experimental effort to determine the magnitude of the CKM matrix elements and to measure the CP violating phase is therefore of fundamental importance.

B meson decay provides an ideal opportunity to pursue such a program. Since the dominant B meson decay mechanisms involve generation changing transitions which are suppressed by the small CKM matrix element V_{cb}, rare processes such as $b \to s$, $b \to u$, and $b \to d$ transitions are expected to be observable. Several of these B decay mechanisms are shown in Figure 1. Measurements of B meson decay rates are used to determine the couplings between quarks of the third generation and lighter quarks, the CKM elements

$|V_{cb}|$, $|V_{ub}|$, $|V_{ts}|$, and $|V_{td}|$. In addition, the Standard Model predicts large CP asymmetries for the B system. Experiments with B mesons may lead to the first precise determination of the complex CKM phase.

In the framework of the Standard Model the CKM matrix must be unitary, *ie.* $VV^\dagger = 1$. This gives rise to the following relationships between the matrix elements.

$$V_{ud}^* V_{us} + V_{cd}^* V_{cs} + V_{td}^* V_{ts} = 0$$

$$V_{us}^* V_{ub} + V_{cs}^* V_{cb} + V_{ts}^* V_{tb} = 0$$

$$V_{ub}^* V_{ud} + V_{cb}^* V_{cd} + V_{tb}^* V_{td} = 0$$

Chau, Keung [5] and Bjorken have noted that the last equation can be visualized as a triangle in the complex plane with vertices at $(0,0)$, $(0,1)$ and (ρ,η). Measurements of the magnitudes of the CKM elements determine the lengths of the sides of the triangle, while measurements of CP asymmetries determine the interior angles of the triangle.

In recent years, there have been major advances in our understanding of B meson decay. However, data samples at least one order of magnitude larger than those available at present are required to observe CP violating asymmetries in the B meson system and to provide fundamental consistency checks of the Standard Model. This is the justification for the construction of high luminosity e^+e^- storage rings in the US at SLAC(PEP II/BABAR) [6], at Cornell (CESR PHASE III, CLEO III) [7], and in Japan(TRISTAN-II/BELLE) [8], as well as a dedicated fixed target experiment at the HERA ring at DESY [9], and proposals for hadron collider experiments at Fermilab [10] and at CERN [11].

In this paper we will review the current status of experimental B physics and then briefly discuss CP violation. Most of our present knowledge on B mesons comes from experiments performed on the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance at a center of mass energy of 10.58 GeV and in recent times from the large data sample of about 3 fb^{-1} that has been collected by the CLEO II collaboration at the Cornell Electron Storage Ring (CESR). Older results from the ARGUS experiment, which operated at the DORIS storage ring and from the CLEO 1.5 experiment, which preceded the CLEO II detector are also included. We note that the LEP experiments and the CDF experiment at the Tevatron Collider have recently provided precise measurements of B meson lifetimes. The LEP experiments have also directly observed the time dependence of $B_d - \bar{B}_d$ mixing and set limits on the $B_s - \bar{B}_s$ mixing. They have also observed exclusive hadronic decays of both B and B_s mesons.

A. Hadronic and Semileptonic B Decays

B meson decays occur primarily through the CKM favored $b \to c$ transition. In such decays the dominant weak decay diagram is the spectator diagram, shown in Fig. 1(a), where the virtual W^- materializes into either a lepton and anti-neutrino or a $\bar{u}d$ or $\bar{c}s$ quark pair. In hadronic decays, the quark pair becomes one of the final state hadrons while the c quark pairs with the spectator anti-quark to form the other hadron, while in semileptonic decays, the c quark and spectator antiquark hadronize independently of the leptonic current.

The extraction of Standard Model parameters from experimental results is complicated by the fact that only B mesons can be studied and not free b quarks. The light quarks and

FIG. 1. B meson decay mechanisms: (a) external spectator diagram and (b) color suppressed spectator diagram (c) $b \to u$ spectator diagram (d) $b \to s\gamma$ electromagnetic penguin (e) W-exchange diagram (f) W-annihilation diagram and (g),(h) box diagrams for $B - \bar{B}$ mixing.

the gluons surrounding the b quark in the B meson lead to significant corrections that have to be taken into account. Since leptons do not interact strongly, semileptonic B meson decays are less affected by these QCD corrections and the theoretical calculations are believed to be more reliable. We discuss several measurements of both inclusive and exclusive semileptonic decay rates that have been used to determine the strength of the $b \to c$ coupling, *ie.* $|V_{cb}|$.

In hadronic decays, the spectator diagram is modified by hard gluon exchanges between the initial and final quark lines. This leads to the "color suppressed" diagram shown in Fig. 1(b), which has a different set of quark pairings. Observation of $B \to \psi X_s$ decays, where X_s is a strange meson, gives experimental evidence for the presence of this diagram. Further information on the size of the color suppressed contribution can be obtained from $\bar{B}^0 \to D^0$ (or D^{*0})X^0 transitions, where X^0 is a neutral meson. In B^- decays, both types of diagrams are present and can interfere. By comparing the rates for B^- and $\bar{B}^0$ decays,

the size and the relative sign of the color suppressed amplitude can be determined.

It was suggested that in analogy to semileptonic decays, two body hadronic decays of B mesons can be expressed as the product of two independent hadronic currents, one describing the formation of a charm meson and the other the hadronization of the $\bar{u}d$ (or $\bar{c}s$) system from the virtual W^- [12]. Qualitatively, for a B decay with a large energy release the $\bar{u}d$ pair, which is produced as a color singlet, travels fast enough to leave the interaction region without influencing the second hadron formed from the c quark and the spectator anti-quark. The assumption that the amplitude can be expressed as the product of two hadronic currents is called "factorization" in this paper. It is expected that the simple approximation of the strong interaction effects by the factorization hypothesis will be more reliable in B meson decays than in the equivalent D meson decays due to the larger characteristic energy transfers and the consequent suppression of final state interactions. We will discuss several tests of the factorization hypothesis based on the comparison of semileptonic and hadronic B meson decays [13].

B. Rare B Decays

All B meson decays that do not occur through the usual $b \to c$ transition are known as rare B decays. The simplest diagram for a rare B decay is obtained by replacing the $b \to c$ transition by a CKM suppressed $b \to u$ transition. These decays probe the small CKM matrix element V_{ub}, the magnitude of which sets bounds on the combination $\rho^2 + \eta^2$ in the Wolfenstein parameterization of the CKM matrix. So far the only measurement of the magnitude of V_{ub} has been obtained from measurements of inclusive semileptonic B decays [14]. We will discuss the status of the search for rare hadronic B decays, and in particular the possibility of measuring the decay $B^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$ which is important for the study of CP violation in B decays.

Since $b \to u$ transitions are suppressed by the small value of $|V_{ub}|$ it is expected that additional diagrams will make observable contributions to some hadronic decay modes. The most significant of these diagrams is the one-loop flavor-changing neutral current diagram known as the "penguin" diagram (Fig. 1 d). The CKM favoured part of this diagram, corresponding to a $b \to s$ transition, is expected to dominate the amplitude of rare decays to final states with one or three s-quarks. There is also a CKM suppressed $b \to d$ amplitude which may not be negligible in decays to final states with no c or s quarks. It should be noted that the loop diagram is much more significant in B decays than in D decays because the $b \to s$ loop is sensitive to the large t quark couplings V_{tb} and V_{ts}, whereas contributions to the equivalent $c \to u$ loop are suppressed either by the small couplings V_{cb} and V_{ub}, or by the small s and d quark masses.

The observation of the decay $B \to K^*(892)\gamma$, reported in 1993 by the CLEO II experiment, is the first direct evidence for the penguin diagram [15]. This decay is described by the electromagnetic transition $b \to s\gamma$, which is a $b \to s$ penguin loop accompanied by the radiation of a photon from either the loop, or the initial or final state quarks. This important new result will be discussed in some detail. We will also comment on the recent discussion about the sensitivity of the $b \to s\gamma$ process to non-standard model contributions within the loop [16]. In many extensions of the standard model an additional contribution to $b \to s\gamma$ is

expected to come from a charged Higgs. We will discuss the extent to which recent data from the CLEO II experiment allow bounds to be set on such non-standard model contributions.

To date, no evidence has been found that either annihilation or W-exchange processes are present in B meson decay. The annihilation diagram (shown in Fig. 1 (f)) would result in purely leptonic decays such as $B^+ \to \tau^+ \bar{\nu}$. These modes have been searched for and provide constraints on the B meson decay constant, f_B.

In 1955, Gell-Mann and Pais predicted oscillations between neutral meson and their antiparticles which were later observed in the neutral kaon system [17]. In the Standard Model such particle-antiparticle oscillations are described by the box diagrams shown in Fig. 1 (g),(h). Historically, it was a great surprise in 1987 when ARGUS observed $B^0 \bar{B}^0$ oscillations at a rate nearly two orders of magnitude larger than the theoretical expectation at that time [18]. This result was the first indication that the top quark was more massive than the 30-50 GeV range anticipated by the theorists and indicated by the UA1 experiment at the time. It also demonstrates how the study of B mesons has provided insight into the physics of higher mass scales.

To summarize, the detailed study of B mesons is driven by the need to determine the elements of the CKM matrix which are fundamental parameters of the Standard Model. A complete set of measurements will overconstrain the Standard Model and will check its internal consistency. In light of recent developments in cosmology, it is conceivable that this will lead us to new physics outside of the framework of the Standard Model. Efforts are now underway to measure additional rare B decays and to observe CP Violation in the B sector. As noted above, every major high energy physics laboratory has embarked on this program.

II. THE EXPERIMENTAL STUDY OF B DECAY

Experimental b physics began in 1977 when the CFS collaboration at Fermilab observed a narrow resonance at an energy of about 9.5 GeV in the reaction p + nucleus $\to \mu^+\mu^-$ + X [19]. This resonance was named $\Upsilon(9460)$ and was subsequently identified as the $1\,^3S_1$ state of the $b\bar{b}$ or bottomonium system. A second resonance at a mass near 10.0 GeV was later isolated in the Fermilab data and later identified as a radial excitation of the $b\bar{b}$ state. For almost two decades which followed, this was the last significant contribution to B physics by a hadron machine as e^+e^- storage rings took over. Within a year of its discovery, the Υ resonance was confirmed by experiments at DORIS [20–22] and at CESR [23,24]. Most of our current knowledge of B mesons is based on analyses of data collected at these two machines. In recent years, advances in detector technology, in particular the introduction of high resolution silicon vertex detectors have allowed experiments at high energy colliders (i.e. LEP, SLC and the TEVATRON) to efficiently tag b quarks. This has led to precise lifetime measurements and to the discovery of new b-flavored hadrons.

A. $\Upsilon(4S)$ Experiments

The total e^+e^- annihilation cross section as a function of center of mass energy in the region of the Υ resonances is shown in Fig. 2. The width of the $\Upsilon(4S)$ state is 23.8 ± 2.2 MeV [25] which is significantly larger than the width of the three lighter resonances. OZI

(Okubo-Zweig-Iizuka) suppression of hadronic decays, which is responsible for the narrow width of the $\Upsilon(1S)$ $\Upsilon(2S)$ and $\Upsilon(3S)$ states is no longer operative. This is the first indication that the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance lies above the threshold for $B\bar{B}$ production. Further evidence for B meson production came from the observation of a dramatic increase in the lepton yield at the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance. The momentum spectrum of the leptons was found to be consistent with production of a heavy quark.

FIG. 2. e^+e^- cross-section measured by CLEO and CUSB showing the masses of the Υ resonances.(Broken horizontal scale)

The first fully reconstructed B mesons were reported in 1983 by the CLEO I collaboration [26]. Since then the CLEO 1.5 experiment [27,28] has collected a sample with an integrated luminosity of 212 pb^{-1} [29], the ARGUS experiment [30–33] has collected 246 pb^{-1}, and the CLEO II experiment has collected about 3 fb^{-1}, of which between 0.9 and 2.0 fb^{-1} have been used to obtain the results described in this review [34,35,39,15]. All of these experiments at e^+e^- colliders record data on the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance, which is only 20 MeV above $B\bar{B}$ threshold. The observed events originate from the decay of either the B or the $\bar{B}$ meson as there is not sufficient energy to produce additional particles. The B mesons are also produced nearly at rest. The average momentum is about 330 MeV so the average decay length is approximately 30 μm. The $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance decays only to $B^0\bar{B}^0$ or to B^+B^- pairs, while heavier states such as B_s or B_c mesons and b-flavored baryons are not accessible.

For quantitative studies of B decays the initial composition of the data sample must be known. The ratio of the production of neutral and charged decays of the $\Upsilon(4S)$ is therefore an important parameter for these experiments. The ratio is denoted

$$\frac{f_+}{f_0} \;=\; \frac{\Upsilon(4S) \to B^+B^-}{\Upsilon(4S) \to B^0\bar{B}^0}.$$

CLEO has measured this ratio and found [40]

$$\frac{f_+}{f_0} \;=\; 1.04 \pm 0.13 \pm 0.12 \pm 0.10$$

The last error is due to the uncertainties in the ratio of B^0 and B^+ lifetimes. This is consistent with equal production of B^+B^- and $B^0\bar{B}^0$ pairs and unless explicitly stated otherwise we will assume that $f_+/f_0 = 1$. Older results which assumed other values of f_+ and f_0 have been rescaled.

B meson pairs from $\Upsilon(4S)$ decays are produced in a state with quantum numbers $J^{PC} = 1^{--}$. As a result the direction of flight of the B meson will follow a $\sin^2\theta_B$ distribution, whereas most of the background has a flat distribution in this variable. An important consequence of production with these quantum numbers is that a $B^0\bar{B}^0$ meson pair will evolve coherently until one of the mesons decays.

1. Continuum Background Suppression

The $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance sits on a continuum background consisting of $e^+e^- \to q\bar{q}$, where q can be any of u, d, s, c. The ratio of the resonance to continuum cross section is approximately 1:3. The continuum background is studied by taking a significant amount of data at an energy just below the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance, e.g. CLEO II records a third of its data at an energy 55 MeV below the resonance. Using this data sample, and Monte Carlo simulations of $q\bar{q}$ jets, cuts have been devised to suppress the continuum background. In $\Upsilon(4S)$ production of

FIG. 3. Absolute value of the cosine of the angle between the the direction of the B candidate and the sphericity axis of the remaining event for (a) continuum data and (b) $B\bar{B}$ Monte Carlo.

$B\bar{B}$ pairs, the B mesons are produced almost at rest, and their decay axes are uncorrelated. These events are rather spherical in shape, and can be distinguished from jetlike continuum events using a variety of event shape variables. For the study of inclusive production in B decays a particularly useful variable is $R_2 = H_2/H_0$, where H_2 and H_0 are the second and zeroth Fox-Wolfram moments [41]. This variable is 0 for a perfectly spherical event, and 1 for an event completely collimated around the jet axis. For the study of exclusive B decay

modes it is often more useful to compare the axis of the reconstructed B candidate with the axis of the rest of the event. Examples of variables used are the direction of the sphericity axis (see Fig. 3) or the thrust axis of the rest of the event with respect to the B candidate, θ_S or θ_T, and the sum of the momenta transverse to the axis of the B candidate, known as $s_\perp$.

In some cases, we will discuss the use of these cuts, and their effectiveness for particular analyses, but refer the reader to other references for a more detailed discussion of the shape variables [42], [43].

2. Selection of B Candidates

As an example of the techniques of B reconstruction we will briefly describe the procedure used by the CLEO II experiment to reconstruct the decay modes $B \to D^{(*)}(n\pi)^-$. The CLEO II detector is described in detail elsewhere [44]. It has a momentum resolution for charged tracks given by $(\delta p/p)^2 = (0.0015p)^2 + (0.005)^2$, and an energy resolution for isolated photons from the CsI barrel calorimeter of $\delta E/E[\%] = 0.35/E^{0.75} + 1.9 - 0.1E$, where p and E are in GeV. Charged tracks are identified as pions or kaons if they have ionization loss information (dE/dx), and/or time-of-flight information (ToF), consistent with the correct particle hypothesis. Photon candidates are selected from showers in the calorimeter barrel with a minimum energy of 30 MeV, which are not matched to charged tracks, and which have a lateral energy distribution consistent with that expected for a photon. Neutral pions are selected from pairs of photons with an invariant mass within 2.5σ of the known π^0 mass.

Candidate D^0 mesons are identified in the decay modes $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$, $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^0$, and $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-$, while D^+ mesons are identified in the decay mode $D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+$. Charged D^* candidates are found using the decay $D^{*+} \to D^0\pi^+$, while neutral D^* candidates are found using the decay $D^{*0} \to D^0\pi^0$. Other D and D^* decay modes are not used because of poorer signal to background ratios, or because of lower yields [45]. The reconstructed D masses and $D^* - D^0$ mass differences are required to be within 2.5σ of the known values.

The D meson candidates are combined with one or more additional pions to form a B candidate. Cuts on the topology of the rest of the event are made in order to distinguish $B\bar{B}$ events from continuum background, as discussed in the previous section. The following requirements are imposed: $R_2 < 0.5$, and $|\cos(\theta_S)| < 0.9(0.8, 0.7)$ depending on whether there are one(two,three) pions added to the D meson. As is shown in Fig. 3, the cosine of the sphericity angle, θ_S, is uniformly distributed for signal, but peaks near ± 1 for continuum background. Requiring that $|\cos(\theta_S)|$ be less than 0.7 typically removes 80% of the continuum background, while retaining 70% of the B decays.

The measured sum of charged and neutral energies, E_{meas}, of correctly reconstructed B mesons produced at the $\Upsilon(4S)$, must equal the beam energy, E_{beam}, to within the experimental resolution. Depending on the B decay mode, $\sigma_{\Delta E}$, the resolution on the energy difference $\Delta E = E_{beam} - E_{meas}$ varies between 14 and 46 MeV. Note that this resolution is usually sufficient to distinguish the correct B decay mode from a mode that differs by one pion. For final states with a fast ρ^- the energy resolution depends on the momenta of the final state pions from the ρ meson. This dependence is conveniently parameterized as a function of the angle between the π^- direction in the ρ^- rest frame and the ρ^- direction in

FIG. 4. The beam constrained mass distributions from CLEO II [34] for: (a) $B^- \to D^0\pi^-$ decays. (b) $B^- \to D^0\rho^-$ decays for $|\cos\Theta_\rho| > 0.4$. (c) $\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\pi^-$ decays . (d) $\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\rho^-$ decays for $|\cos\Theta_\rho| > 0.4$.

the lab frame, which we denote as the ρ helicity angle, Θ_ρ. When $\cos\Theta_\rho = +1$, the error in the energy measurement is dominated by the momentum resolution on the fast π^-, whereas at $\cos\Theta_\rho = -1$ the largest contribution to the error in the energy measurement comes from the calorimeter energy resolution on the fast π^0.

To determine the signal yield and display the data the beam constrained mass is formed

$$M_B^2 = E_{beam}^2 - \left(\sum_i \vec{p_i}\right)^2, \tag{3}$$

where $\vec{p_i}$ is the momentum of the i-th daughter of the B candidate. The resolution in this variable is determined by the beam energy spread, and is about 2.7 MeV for CLEO II, and about 4.0 MeV for ARGUS. [46] These resolutions are a factor of ten better than the resolution in invariant mass obtained without the beam energy constraint. The invariant mass spectra from the CLEO II analysis of $B \to D(n\pi)^-$ decays are shown in Fig. 4 [34].

For a specific B decay chain, such as $B^- \to D^0\pi^-, D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^0$ there may be multiple combinations in a given decay chain. In the CLEO II analysis, if there are multiple candidates

only the entry with the smallest absolute value of ΔE is selected for events with $M_B > 5.2$ GeV. An alternative method is to select the candidate with the highest total probability as calculated from the sum of all χ^2 contributions from particle identification, kinematical fits and the beam energy constraint [32].

3. Background Studies

In order to extract the number of signal events it is crucial to understand the shape of the background in the M_B distribution. There are two contributions to this background, continuum and other $B\bar{B}$ decays. The fraction of continuum background varies between 58% and 91% depending on the B decay mode [47]. The shape of the continuum background is well understood since it depends primarily on the transverse momentum distributions of the final state particles relative to the jet axis. This has been studied using the off-resonance data sample, and using Monte Carlo techniques.

The shape of the $B\bar{B}$ background is more difficult to understand since it is mode dependent. It also has a tendency to peak in the signal region, since the combinatorial background comes mostly from combinations in which the true final state is altered by one low energy particle. A particularly troublesome background occurs when the decay $D^{*0} \to D^0\gamma$ is replaced by the decay $D^{*0} \to D^0\pi^0$. To determine the correct background shape for each B decay mode, CLEO II has studied the M_B distributions for ΔE sidebands, and for combinations in which the charged particles have the wrong charges for the expected spectator decay diagram, e.g. $D^+\pi^+$ and $\bar{D}^0\pi^+$.

It is found that all of the background distributions can be fitted with a linear background below M_B=5.282 GeV, and a smooth kinematical cutoff at the endpoint, which is chosen to be parabolic. For each B decay mode CLEO II uses this background function and a Gaussian signal with a fixed width of 2.64 MeV to determine the yield of signal events. In the ARGUS and CLEO 1.5 experiments slightly different background parameterizations were used [48].

B. High Energy Collider Experiments

While the $\Upsilon(4S)$ machines are well suited to study many aspects of B physics some questions can only be investigated by experiments at higher center of mass energies. These include lifetime measurements and the search for heavier b-flavored mesons and baryons.

The four LEP experiments and SLD operate on the Z^0 resonance. At this energy, the cross section for $b\bar{b}$ production is about 6.6 nb and the signal-to-noise ratio for hadronic events is 1:4, comparable to the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance. The kinematic constraints available on the $\Upsilon(4S)$ cannot be used on the Z^0 but due to the large boost the b quarks travel ≈ 2.5 mm before they decay and the decay products of the two b-hadrons are clearly separated in the detector. The large boost makes precise lifetime measurements possible as well as observations of time dependent phenomena such as $B_d - \bar{B}_d$ mixing.

Compared to e^+e^- annihilation, the $b\bar{b}$ production cross section at hadron colliders is enormous, about $50\mu b$ at 1.8 TeV. However, a signal-to-background ratio of about 1:50 makes it difficult to extract b quark signals and to fully reconstruct B mesons.

In the past, evidence for the production of b quarks in high energy experiments has been deduced from the presence of high $p_\perp$ leptons. At hadron colliders, selecting final states containing leptons also provides a powerful tool to suppress QCD backgrounds. Recently, significant progress in the isolation of events containing b quarks has been made possible by the installation of silicon vertex detectors near the interaction point at several collider experiments.

FIG. 5. (a) The ψK^+ mass distribution from the CDF experiment (b) The ψK^{*0} mass distribution from the CDF experiment. The solid line indicates the fitted region [207].

These b quarks hadronize as B_d, B_u, B_s, and B_c mesons or as baryons containing b quarks. With the improvement in background suppression provided by these solid state detectors, signals for exclusive hadronic B_d, B_u and B_s meson decays have been isolated in the invariant mass spectra for low multiplicity final states. Examples include the decay modes $B^{+(0)} \to \psi K^{+(0*)}$ shown in Fig. 5 and $B_s \to \psi\phi$ shown in Fig. 9. However, the resolution in invariant mass for high energy experiments, which is of order 10-20 MeV, is poorer than the resolution in beam constrained mass in threshold experiments. At CDF, the mass resolution, about 10 MeV, is sufficient to separate modes such as $B^- \to \psi\pi^-$ from $B^- \to \psi K^-$. However, for experiments at LEP the mass resolution is frequently not sufficient to clearly separate B meson decay modes with an additional photon or modes where one kaon is replaced with a pion. Evidence for the production of b-flavored baryons has also been reported recently but the relative production fractions are not well known [49].

Although collider experiments cannot determine absolute branching fractions without making further assumptions or using information from experiments at the $\Upsilon(4S)$, they can measure ratios of branching fractions such as the ratio $\mathcal{B}(B \to \psi K^*)/\mathcal{B}(B \to \psi K)$. Some high energy experiments have also obtained inclusive signals for D^0, D^{*+}, ψ mesons in B decay.

C. Determination of Average B Meson Branching Fractions

To extract B meson branching fractions, the detection efficiencies are determined from a Monte Carlo simulation and the yields are corrected for the charmed meson branching fractions. In order to determine new average branching ratios for B meson decays the results from individual experiments must be normalized with respect to a common set of charm meson and baryon absolute branching fractions. The branching fractions for the D^0 and D^+ modes used to calculate the B branching fractions are given in Tables I, II. We have chosen the average of values for the $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ branching fraction recently reported by CLEO II and ALEPH to normalize the results [50]. The branching fractions of other D^0 decay modes relative to $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ are taken from the PDG compilation [25]. The D^+ branching fractions are also taken from the PDG compilation [25].

TABLE I. D^0 branching fractions [%] used in previous publications and this review.

Mode	ARGUS, CLEO 1.5 [28], [31]	ARGUS (DD_s) [33]	CLEO II [34]	This review
$K^-\pi^+$	4.2 ± 0.6	3.7 ± 0.3	3.9 ± 0.2	3.9 ± 0.2
$K^-\pi^+\pi^-\pi^+$	9.1 ± 1.1	7.5 ± 0.5	8.0 ± 0.5	7.9 ± 0.6
$K^-\pi^+\pi^0$	13.3 ± 1.8	11.3 ± 1.1	12.1 ± 1.1	13.4 ± 1.15
$K^0\pi^+\pi^-$	6.4 ± 1.1	5.4 ± 0.5		5.1 ± 0.6

TABLE II. D^+ branching fractions [%] used in previous publications and this review.

Mode	ARGUS, CLEO 1.5 [28], [31]	ARGUS (DD_s) [33]	CLEO II [34]	This review
$K^-\pi^+\pi^+$	9.1 ± 1.4	7.7 ± 1.0	9.1 ± 1.4	9.1 ± 0.6
$K^0\pi^+$	3.2 ± 0.5	2.6 ± 0.4		2.7 ± 0.3
$K^0\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-$		6.9 ± 1.1		7.0 ± 1.0

Branching ratios for all D_s decay modes are normalized relative to $\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \to \phi\pi^+)$. There are no model-independent measurements of the absolute branching fraction for $D_s^+ \to \phi\pi^+$. The currently favored method uses measurements of $\Gamma(D_s^+ \to \phi\ell^+\nu)/\Gamma(D_s^+ \to \phi\pi^+)$. The rate $\Gamma(D_s^+ \to \phi^+\ell\nu)$ is determined from measurements of $\tau_{D_s^+}/\tau_{D^+}$, $\Gamma(D^+ \to K^*\ell\nu)$, and using $\Gamma(D^+ \to K^*\ell\nu)/\ \Gamma(D_s^+ \to \phi\ell^+\nu)$ obtained from theory. We use the value of $\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \to \phi\pi^+)$ derived in reference [51]. Other methods include using $\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \to X\ell^+\nu)$ obtained by combining measurements of $\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \to \phi\ell^+\nu)/\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \to \phi\pi^+)$, $\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \to \eta\ell^+\nu)/\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \to \phi\pi^+)$, $\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \to \eta^{'}\ell^+\nu)/\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \to \phi\pi^+)$ and comparing to $\mathcal{B}(D_s \to X\ell\nu)$ obtained from $\mathcal{B}(D^0 \to X\ell\nu)$ and the ratio of τ_{D^0}/τ_{D_s}. This method also gives values in the same range. We believe, however, that the PDG group has underestimated the error on this value.

TABLE III. D_s branching fraction [%] used in previous publications and this review.

Mode	CLEO 1.5 [28]	ARGUS (DD_s) [33]	CLEO II [39]	This review
$\phi\pi^+$	2.7 ± 0.7	3.0 ± 1.1	3.5 ± 0.4	3.7 ± 0.9

Since the publication of the original ARGUS and CLEO 1.5 papers on hadronic decays, the branching fractions for the $D^* \to D\pi(\gamma)$ modes have been significantly improved by

more precise measurements from CLEO II [52]. For modes which contain D^* mesons we have recalculated the branching ratios using the CLEO II measurements.

TABLE IV. D^* branching fractions [%] used in previous publications and this review.

Mode	ARGUS, CLEO 1.5 [28], [31]	CLEO II [34]	This review
$D^{*0} \to D^0\pi^0$	55.0 ± 6	63.6 ± 4.0	63.6 ± 4.0
$D^{*0} \to D^0\gamma$	45.0 ± 6	36.4 ± 4.0	36.4 ± 4.0
$D^{*+} \to D^0\pi^+$	57.0 ± 6	68.1 ± 1.6	68.1 ± 1.6

TABLE V. Charmonium branching fractions [%] used in previous publications and this review.

Mode	ARGUS, CLEO 1.5 [28], [31]	CLEO II [34]	This review [53]
$\psi \to e^+e^-$	6.9 ± 0.9	5.91 ± 0.25	5.91 ± 0.25
$\psi \to \mu^+\mu^-$	6.9 ± 0.9	5.91 ± 0.25	5.91 ± 0.25
$\psi' \to e^+e^-$ and $\mu^+\mu^-$	1.7 ± 0.3	1.7 ± 0.3	1.7 ± 0.3
$\psi' \to \psi\pi^+\pi^-$	32.4 ± 2.6	32.4 ± 2.6	32.4 ± 2.6
$\chi_{c1} \to \psi\gamma$	27.3 ± 1.6	27.3 ± 1.6	27.3 ± 1.6
$\chi_{c2} \to \psi\gamma$		13.5 ± 1.1	13.5 ± 1.1

We also give the old and new values assumed for the branching fractions of the decays $\psi \to e^+e^-$ and $\psi \to \mu^+\mu^-$. We have chosen to use the precise measurement of these decays performed by the MARK III collaboration [53]. The modes $\psi' \to \ell^+\ell^-$ and $\psi' \to \psi\pi^+\pi^-$ are used to form B meson candidates in modes involving ψ' mesons. Decays of B meson into final states containing χ_c mesons are reconstructed using the channel $\chi_{c1,\,(c2)} \to \psi\gamma$. Product branching ratios for all modes containing ψ mesons have been rescaled to account for the improved ψ branching fractions.

In the cases where only one D^0 decay mode was used to reconstruct the B meson the published branching ratio is simply rescaled. The procedure for re-calculating the branching ratios becomes more involved when more than one D decay channel is used. CLEO 1.5 and ARGUS used the following procedure to obtain their results

$$\mathcal{B}(B) \;=\; \frac{N_{observed}}{\epsilon \times N_B \times (\mathcal{B}(D^*)) \times \sum \mathcal{B}_i(D^0)}$$

where N_B is the number of B mesons. The efficiency ϵ is defined as

$$\epsilon \;=\; \frac{\sum \mathcal{B}_i(D^0)\epsilon_i}{\sum \mathcal{B}_i(D^0)}$$

The index i refers to the D meson decay channel. Therefore the rescaled branching ratio is given by

$$\mathcal{B} \;=\; \frac{N_{observed}}{N_B \times (\mathcal{B}(D^*)) \times \sum \mathcal{B}_i(D^0)\epsilon_i}$$

The CLEO collaboration published enough information, including the yields and the efficiencies for the individual D^0 decay channels, so that rescaling their B branching ratios is straightforward.

The CLEO II branching ratios for $B \to D^{(*)}$ decays are calculated as weighted average of the results determined in each D sub-mode. Since yield and efficiencies were provided in the original publication, the results could easily be rescaled to accommodate the improved D^0 and D^+ branching ratios.

Although the D^0 reconstruction efficiencies depend slightly on the B meson decay channel under study, the only information available from the ARGUS collaboration are average D^0 reconstruction efficiencies $< \epsilon >_i$. Therefore we had to make the assumption that the correct way to renormalize the ARGUS results is to multiply their branching ratios by the scale factor F where

$$F \;=\; \frac{\sum < \epsilon >_i \times \mathcal{B}_i(D^0)_{old}}{\sum < \epsilon >_i \times \mathcal{B}_i(D^0)_{new}}$$

The validity of this assumption has been checked using CLEO 1.5 data. A similar procedure had to be employed for the CLEO II results on $B \to DD_s$.

Statistical errors are recalculated in the same way as the branching ratios. For the results from individual experiments on B decays to final states with D mesons two systematic errors are quoted. The second systematic error contains the contribution due to the uncertainties in the $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$, $D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+$ or $D_s \to \phi\pi$ branching fractions. This will allow easier rescaling when these branching ratios are measured more precisely. The first systematic error includes the experimental uncertainties and when relevant the uncertainties in the ratios of charm branching ratios, e.g. $\Gamma(D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-)/\Gamma(D^0 \to K^-\pi^+)$ and the error in the D^* branching fractions. For modes involving D_s mesons, the first systematic error also includes the uncertainties due to the the D^0 and D^+ branching ratios. For all other modes only one systematic error is given. For the world averages, the statistical and the first systematic error are combined in quadrature while the errors due to the D^0, D^+ and D_s branching ratio scales are still listed separately. With the improvement in the precision of the D^0 and D^* branching fractions these are no longer the dominant source of systematic error in the study of hadronic B meson decay. The error on the D_s^+ branching ratio scale remains large.

III. B MESON MASSES AND LIFETIMES

Particles are characterized by their mass, lifetimes and internal quantum numbers. Only four b-flavored mesons have been established to date. The bound states with a b quark and a $\bar{u}$ or $\bar{d}$ anti-quark are referred to as the B_d ($\bar{B^0}$) and the B_u (B^-) mesons, respectively. The first radial excitation is called the B^* meson. The B_s meson, a bound state containing a b quark and $\bar{s}$ anti-quark, has been discovered in the past two years. The spectrum of known and predicted B states is shown in Fig. 6. These predictions are taken from a recent potential model calculation by Eichten, Hill and Quigg (EHQ) [55]. The spectrum reflects the remarkable feature of heavy quark spin symmetry. In the limit of large heavy quark masses, the spin of the heavy quark decouples from the dynamics and the pseudoscalar and vector states will be degenerate. In the B system, an indication that this symmetry is respected is the experimental ratio

FIG. 6. Measured and predicted masses of the low-lying B meson states. The predictions are taken from the EHQ model.

$$\frac{m_{B^*} - m_B}{m_B} \sim 0.9\,\%. \tag{4}$$

Since the ground state mesons containing heavy quarks decay weakly, their lifetimes are typical of the weak interaction scale, in the range of 0.1-2 ps. Ten years ago, before the MAC [56] and MARK II [57] collaborations presented the first measurement of the b lifetime, the only phenomenological guide to the strength of the coupling between the quark generations was the Cabibbo angle. If the coupling between the third and second generations had the same strength as the coupling between the second and first, the b lifetime would be about 0.1 ps. The measurements of lifetimes from the PEP experiments that indicated a value longer than 1 ps were not anticipated. Since to first order the b lifetime can be expressed in analogy to muon decay

$$\tau \;=\; \frac{1}{\Gamma_{tot}} \;=\; \frac{\mathcal{B}_{sl}}{\Gamma_{sl}} \;=\; \frac{\mathcal{B}_{sl}}{\frac{G_F^2}{192\pi^3} m_b^5 |V_{cb}|^2 \times \mathit{phase\ space}}$$

it was concluded that the CKM matrix element $|V_{cb}|$ was very small.

In the naive spectator model, all mesons and baryons containing b quarks have the same lifetime. Differences in the hadronic decay channels and interference between contributing amplitudes, *i.e.* if the same final state can be reached through an external and internal spectator decay such as $B^- \to D^0\pi^-$, will modify this simple picture and give rise to a hierarchy of lifetimes. For the b system we expect [58]

$$\tau(B^-) \;\geq\; \tau(\bar{B}^0) \;\approx\; \tau(B_s) \;>\; \tau(\Lambda_b^0) \tag{5}$$

A similar lifetime hierarchy has been observed in charm decay. However, since the lifetime differences are expected to scale as $1/m_Q^2$, where m_Q is the mass of the heavy quark, the variation in the b system should be less than 10%. Measurements of lifetimes for the various b-flavored hadrons thus provide a way to determine the importance of non-spectator mechanisms.

A. $\bar{B}^0$ and B^- Masses.

We now discuss measurements of the $\bar{B}^0$ and B^- masses and the mass difference between them. For these analyses only fully reconstructed B decays in modes with good signal to background are used. As an example, CLEO II [34] uses the modes $B^- \to \psi K^-$, $\bar{B}^0 \to \psi K^{*0}$, $B^- \to D^0\pi^-$, $B^- \to D^0\rho^-$, $B^- \to D^{*0}\pi^-$, $B^- \to D^{*0}\rho^-$, $\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\pi^-$, $\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\rho^-$, $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^-$, and $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\rho^-$. With tight cuts, 362 B^- and 340 B^0 candidates have

FIG. 7. Beam constrained mass distributions from CLEO II for (a) B^- events and (b) $\bar{B}^0$ events.

been reconstructed. The beam constrained mass distributions for the sum of these modes are shown in Fig. 7.

The absolute values of the B^- and $\bar{B}^0$ masses are limited in accuracy by the knowledge of the beam energy. A correction of (-1.1±0.5) MeV is made for initial state radiation as described in Ref. [59]. The systematic error from the uncertainty in the absolute value of the CESR/DORIS energy scale is determined by calibrating to the known $\Upsilon(1S)$ mass. The mass difference is determined more accurately than the masses themselves, because the beam energy uncertainty cancels, as do many systematic errors associated with the measurement errors on the charged tracks and neutral pions. There are several models which predict the isospin mass difference [60], which give values between 1.2 and 2.3 MeV which are larger than

TABLE VI. Measurements of the $\bar{B}^0$ and B^- Masses [MeV].

Experiment	$M_{\bar{B}^0}$	M_{B^-}	$M_{\bar{B}^0} - M_{B^-}$
ARGUS	$5279.6 \pm 0.7 \pm 2.0$	$5280.5 \pm 1.0 \pm 2.0$	$-0.9 \pm 1.2 \pm 0.5$
CLEO 87	$5278.0 \pm 0.4 \pm 2.0$	$5278.3 \pm 0.4 \pm 2.0$	$-0.4 \pm 0.6 \pm 0.5$
CLEO 93	$5279.2 \pm 0.2 \pm 2.0$	$5278.8 \pm 0.2 \pm 2.0$	$0.41 \pm 0.25 \pm 0.19$
Average	$5278.9 \pm 0.2 \pm 2.0$	$5278.7 \pm 0.2 \pm 2.0$	0.2 ± 0.3

the experimental results given in Table VI. However, Goity and Hou as well as Lebed [61] have found models that can lead to small values of the mass difference. That the $\bar{B}^0 - B^-$ mass difference is much smaller than the corresponding mass differences in the K and D mesons is surprising.

We conclude this section on the B meson masses with a result that will be discussed in greater detail in Section V. In the neutral B meson system, the eigenstates of the strong and electromagnetic interaction (production) do not coincide with the weak eigenstates (decay). According to the CPT theorem, the flavor eigenstates $B^0 = (d\bar{b})$ and $\bar{B}^0 = (\bar{d}b)$ must have equal mass and lifetime but this is not required for the weak eigenstates B_1 and B_2. The situation is similar to the neutral kaon system. The $B_1 - B_2$ mass difference is too small to be measured directly but it can be determined from the rate of $B^0\bar{B}^0$ oscillations (see Section V A)

$$|\Delta m_{(B_1 - B_2)}| = \frac{x_d}{\tau_{B^0}} = (3.07 \pm 0.17) \times 10^{-4} \text{ eV}$$

x_d is the $B^0\bar{B}^0$ mixing parameter. This is about 100 times larger than the corresponding mass difference in the $K^0\bar{K}^0$ system.

B. Measurement of the B^* Mass

The vector partner of the pseudoscalar B meson is called B^*. It has been observed by the CUSB and CLEO collaborations through the electromagnetic transition $B^* \to \gamma B$ [62], [63] which gives a quasi-monochromatic photon. CLEO has determined the $B^* - B$ mass difference to be $(46.4 \pm 0.3 \pm 0.8)$ MeV which combined with the average B mass gives

$$m_{B^*} = 5325.2 \pm 0.5 \pm 2.8 \text{ MeV}$$

B^* production has also been been observed by the LEP experiment [64], [69], [70].

C. Observation of B^{**} Production

Evidence for production of orbitally excited B meson states has recently been reported by the OPAL and DELPHI collaborations [80], [81]. As noted by Gronau, Nippe and Rosner [79], B^{**} mesons, if produced in sufficient quantity, allow self-tagging flavor identification at production time. They could provide a powerful tool to study flavor oscillations and CP violation in the neutral B system. B^{**} mesons containing a u or d quark are expected to decay to $B\pi$ or $B^*\pi$ while the dominant decay for B_s^{**} states is $B_s^{**} \to B^{(*)}K$.

FIG. 8. DELPHI results on B^{**} production. (a) Distribution of the Q-value for $B^{(*)}\pi$ pairs (data points) along with the Monte Carlo expectation without B^{**} production (shaded area). Q is defined as $Q = m_{B^{(*)}\pi} - m_{B^{(*)}} - m_\pi$. (b) Background subtracted $B^{(*)}\pi$ pair Q-value distribution with a Gaussian fit overlaid.

Inclusive correlations between charged pions and b quark jets as well the displacement of the decay products of the b quark jet from the interaction point are used by the LEP experiments. This method does not distinguish between B and B^* mesons. Evidence for production of orbitally excited B_s^{**} mesons is found using inclusive correlations between the fragmentation kaon and the products of the b quark jet. The results of the DELPHI analysis are shown in Figure 8. They observe $2157 \pm 120 \pm 323$ candidates and extract a fragmentation ratio for b quark jets to a $B_{u,d}^{**}$ meson of [81]

$$\sigma_{B_{u,d}^{**}/\sigma_{b-jet}} \;=\; 0.27 \pm 0.02 \pm 0.06$$

The width of the measured signal is consistent with the predictions for orbital excitations. Assuming a $B^*\pi$ to $B\pi$ ratio of 2:1, the $B_{u,d}^{**}$ mass averaged over the four expected states is determined to

$$m_{B_{u,d}^{**}} \;=\; 5732 \pm 5 \pm 20 \text{ MeV}$$

OPAL has studied $B\pi$ and BK correlations and found the probability that the pion charge correctly tags the b quark flavor to be 0.706 ± 0.013 [80].

D. Measurement of the B_s Mass

Evidence for exclusive B_s decays has been reported by the CDF [67], OPAL [68], ALEPH [69], and DELPHI collaborations [70]. CDF observes a signal of 32.9 ± 6.8 events in the

FIG. 9. The ψK^+K^- mass distribution from the CDF experiment for events with K^+K^- mass within 10 MeV/c^2 of the nominal ϕ mass.

$B_s \to \psi\phi$ mode (see Fig. 9) and determines the B_s mass to be $5367.7 \pm 2.4 \pm 4.8$ MeV. OPAL finds one B_s candidate in the $\psi\phi$ mode which is used to extract a mass of $5359 \pm 19 \pm 7$ MeV for the B_s meson. ALEPH finds one unambiguous B_s event in the $B_s \to \psi'\phi$ mode and obtains a mass of $5368.6 \pm 5.6 \pm 1.5$ MeV. Finally, DELPHI has three candidates of which one is in the $B_s \to \psi\phi$ mode and obtains a mass of $5374 \pm 16 \pm 2$ MeV [70]. By reconstructing exclusive B^- and $\bar{B}^0$ decays (see Fig. 5), the high energy experiments calibrate their B_s measurements relative to the known B^- and $\bar{B}^0$ masses. The four B_s mass measurements are consistent with each other. The average value

$$m_{B_s} \;=\; 5368.1 \pm 3.8 \text{ MeV}$$

is consistent with quark model predictions [55,71].

E. b-Baryon Masses

Evidence for the production of Λ_b and Ξ_b baryons has been found in $\Lambda - \ell^+$ and $\Xi - \ell^+$ correlations, respectively [75]. OPAL has reported preliminary evidence for $\Lambda_b^0 \to \Lambda_c^+\pi^-$ [76]. However, the value originally quoted for the Λ_b mass, $m_{\Lambda_b^0} = 5620 \pm 30$ MeV, is not confirmed by later data from OPAL which show no evidence for this decay mode. The current upper limit at 90% C.L. for the product branching ratio is [77]

$$\mathcal{B}(b \to \Lambda_b) \times \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_b \to \Lambda_c^+\pi^-) \;<\; 1.9 \times 10^{-3}$$

Earlier claims by the UA1 and ISR experiments for the decay $\Lambda_b \to \Lambda\psi$ in $p\bar{p}$ collisions have been ruled out by the CDF and LEP experiments [78] who find

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{B}(b \to \Lambda_b) \times \mathcal{B}(\Lambda_b \to \Lambda\psi) &< 1.8 \times 10^{-4}, && \text{CDF + LEP} \\ &= (1.8 \pm 1.0) \times 10^{-3}, && \text{UA1} \end{aligned}$$

F. Techniques of b Lifetime Measurements

The pioneering measurements by the experiments at PEP established a lifetime greater than 1 ps for a mixture of b flavored hadrons. This is far too short to be directly measured in threshold experiments. At higher b momenta when combined with relativistic time dilation, however, the hadron containing the b quark travels a measurable distance before decaying. The lifetime of a particle is related to its decay length by

$$\tau_b \;=\; \frac{L_b}{\gamma\beta c} \tag{6}$$

At LEP energies, for example, the average b momentum is about 30 GeV which yields an average decay length of 2.5 mm for $< \tau_b >= 1.5$ ps. Similarly, at CDF the mean vertex displacement in the transverse direction is about 0.9 mm.

A variety of methods has been developed to measure the decay length and to determine the b lifetime. They all follow the same principal steps. A purified sample is selected and the decay length is either measured directly or determined indirectly by using the impact parameter. The resulting decay length is then corrected for the Lorentz boost. An additional correction for background contamination is applied as well.

1. Selection of an enriched b sample

Ideally, one would like to have a sample of fully reconstructed decays to determine the lifetime of a specific b hadron. The b vertex could then be reconstructed allowing a measurement of the decay length. The momentum of the b hadron gives the $\gamma\beta$ factor in equation (6) without any further assumptions. The resulting proper time distribution would be an exponential convoluted with a Gaussian resolution function representing the experimental measurement errors. Although currently limited by statistics this procedure will ultimately yield the most precise measurements of individual b hadron lifetimes.

The best statistical precision in the determination of lifetimes of hadrons containing b quarks is currently obtained from measurements using partial reconstruction of semileptonic decays. These decays represent about 21% of the total b decay rate and have the experimental advantage that both electrons and muons can be efficiently identified with low background. The purity of the sample can be enhanced by kinematical cuts which take advantage of the large mass of the b quark e.g. selecting leptons with large transverse momentum with respect to the b direction. Event samples with purities above 90% have been obtained at LEP. However, in such semileptonic decays the neutrino is not detected so the b hadron is not completely reconstructed. One then has to rely on Monte Carlo simulations to estimate the b momentum and to extract the proper time distribution from the decay length measurements.

At the TEVATRON the inclusive b samples with the best signal to background ratios are obtained by selecting events with two energetic leptons from ψ decay and a detached vertex.

For inclusive lifetime measurements, the presence of a high $p_\perp$ lepton or a ψ meson is usually sufficient to demonstrate the presence of a b quark, while for exclusive measurements of individual b hadron lifetimes an additional particle in the decay has to be reconstructed in order to establish a signature characteristic for the decaying b hadron (Fig 10(b)). The

FIG. 10. Lifetime measurements using the impact parameter method (a) and reconstruction of the b decay vertex (b).

Λ_b lifetime, for example, is measured using a sample of events containing $\Lambda_c^+\ell^-$ or $\Lambda\ell^-$ combinations.

2. Impact parameter method

In early experiments the vertexing precision was not sufficient to measure the decay length, $l = \gamma\beta c\tau$, directly. The impact parameter method shown schematically in Fig. 10(a) was developed as alternative. Due to the finite lifetime of the b hadron, a lepton from the semileptonic decay of the heavy quark will miss the primary vertex where the b hadron was produced. The miss distance or impact parameter, δ, is given by

$$\delta = \gamma\beta c\tau_b \sin\alpha \sin\theta. \tag{7}$$

where α is the angle between the lepton and b directions and θ is the polar angle. The b direction is usually approximated by the axis of the hadronic jet. A negative sign is assigned to the impact parameter if the lepton track crosses the jet axis behind the the beam spot indicating a mismeasured lepton or a background event. The main advantage of the impact parameter method is that it is rather insensitive to the unknown boost of the parent; as $\gamma\beta$ increases with the b momentum, $\sin\alpha$ decreases approximately as $1/\gamma\beta$ for $\beta \approx 1$ [43].

Improvements in lifetime measurements have come about from larger data samples, smaller beam spots, the use of neutral energy in the jet finding algorithms as well as three dimensional vertex reconstruction. In the best LEP measurements the average impact parameter uncertainty has been reduced to about 80 μm [49]. The disadvantage of this method is, that a single track is a relative poor estimator for the b decay length and not all the available information in the event is used. Today, impact parameter measurements are used only for inclusive lifetime measurements and for cases in which the b decay length cannot be easily reconstructed [49].

3. Decay length measurements

New interaction region designs with smaller radius beampipes and beam spots[1] combined with high resolution silicon vertex detector allow for decay length measurements with a precision better than 300 μm. This is a factor of 10 smaller than the average b flight distance at LEP. As indicated in Fig 10(b) the b vertex is reconstructed using the lepton track and the direction of the reconstructed charm meson. The momentum of the b hadron is estimated using the observed decay products, missing momentum and a correction factor determined from a Monte Carlo simulation. The proper time distribution is then given by an exponential convoluted with a Gaussian resolution function and the momentum correction factor. A maximum likelihood fit is used to extract the lifetime [82].

4. Averaging lifetime measurements

In order to obtain the most precise value for inclusive and exclusive b lifetimes the results of lifetime measurements from different experiments have been combined. Using the conventional approach of weighting the measurements according to their error does not take into account the underlying exponential (lifetime) distribution. If a measurement fluctuates low then its weight in the average will increase, leading to a bias towards low values. This is particularly relevant for low statistics measurements such as the B_s lifetime. According to a study by Forty [75], this bias can be avoided if the weight is calculated using the relative error σ_i/τ_i. [2] We find a 1-3% difference in the average lifetimes computed, with the second method giving the larger value. A slight bias of the latter method towards higher lifetime values could be avoided by taking into account asymmetric errors. This effect has been found empirically to be rather small and we omit this additional complication in the calculation of our lifetime averages.

G. Inclusive b Lifetime

Inclusive measurements of the b lifetime were important historically to establish the long b lifetime and provided the first evidence that the coupling between the second and third quark generation is quite small. They are still needed for some electroweak studies such as the determination of the forward-backward asymmetry in $Z \to b\bar{b}$ where the different hadrons containing b quarks are not distinguished. For B physics, *i.e.* the study of B meson decays, the exclusive measurements of individual b hadron lifetimes are preferable. For example, to extract the value of the CKM matrix element $|V_{cb}|$ from measurements of semileptonic B decays the average of the B^+ and $\bar{B}^0$ lifetimes should be used rather than the inclusive b

[1] Typical beam spot sizes. LEP: $\sigma_x \approx 150\,\mu m$, $\sigma_y \approx 10\,\mu m$, CDF: $\sigma_x \approx 40\,\mu m$, $\sigma_y \approx 40\,\mu m$, SLD: $\sigma_x \approx 2\,\mu m$, $\sigma_y \approx 1\,\mu m$ [49]

[2] This procedure assumes good vertex resolution, *i.e.* $\sigma < \tau/10$.

lifetime which contains additional contributions from B_s mesons and b baryons. Inclusive b lifetime measurements are performed using one of the following three methods:

- Impact parameter method $b \to c\ell\nu$ e.g.

$$< \tau_b > = \ 1.487 \pm 0.023 \pm 0.0384 \text{ ps (ALEPH [83])}$$

- Decay length reconstruction in $b \to \psi X$ e.g.

$$< \tau_b > = \ 1.46 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.06 \text{ ps (CDF [84])}$$

- Vertex topology in hadronic b decays e.g.

$$< \tau_b > = \ 1.599 \pm 0.014 \pm 0.035 \text{ ps (DELPHI [85])}$$

The third method uses displaced multi-prong vertices to reconstruct the decay point of the b hadron. Extensive Monte Carlo simulations are used to estimate the b momentum and to determine the proper time spectrum.

The current world average for the inclusive b lifetime which includes many measurements including those given above is [75],

$$< \tau_b > = \ 1.524 \pm 0.027 \text{ ps.}$$

The world average for this quantity in 1992 was (1.29 ± 0.05) ps. The substantial change in the value has been attributed to several improvements: the use of neutral energy when calculating the b jet direction, and better knowledge of the resolution function as a result of the use of silicon vertex detectors [49], [75].

FIG. 11. D^{*+}-lepton correlations from B decays observed by the CDF collaboration. A clear signal is present in right sign combinations while no signal is present when same sign charged leptons are combined with D^{*+} candidates.

H. Exclusive Lifetime Measurements

Precise measurements of exclusive lifetimes for b-flavored hadrons have been carried out by CDF and by some of the LEP experiments [88], [91], [92], [93], [94]. The most recent results and the techniques used are given in Table VII.

TABLE VII. Measurements of exclusive lifetimes for b flavored hadrons.

Particle	Technique	CDF	ALEPH	OPAL	DELPHI
$\bar{B}^0$	$D^* - l$	$1.62 \pm 0.16 \pm 0.15$	$1.71^{+0.12}_{-0.11} \pm 0.06$	$1.62 \pm 0.10 \pm 0.10$	$1.17^{+0.29}_{-0.23} \pm 0.15 \pm 0.05$
$\bar{B}^0$	excl	$1.57 \pm 0.18 \pm 0.08$	$1.17^{+0.24}_{-0.19} \pm 0.06$		
$\bar{B}^0$	topol.				$1.68 \pm 0.15^{+0.13}_{-0.17}$
B^-	$D - l$	$1.63 \pm 0.20 \pm 0.16$	$1.71 \pm 0.15 \pm 0.08$	$1.53 \pm 0.14 \pm 0.11$	$1.30^{+0.33}_{-0.29} \pm 0.15 \pm 0.05$
B^-	excl	$1.61 \pm 0.16 \pm 0.05$	$1.30^{+0.25}_{-0.20} \pm 0.06$		
B^-	topol.				$1.72 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.06$
B_s^0	$D_s - l$	$1.42^{+0.27}_{-0.23} \pm 0.11$	$1.90^{+0.46}_{-0.36} \pm 0.05$	$1.33^{+0.26}_{-0.21} \pm 0.06$	$1.34^{+0.37}_{-0.29} \pm 0.14$
B_s^0	$D_s - h$		$1.75^{+0.30+0.18}_{-0.28-0.23}$		$1.56 \pm 0.35 \pm 0.23$
B_s^0	$\psi\phi$	$1.74^{+1.08}_{-0.69} \pm 0.07$			
Λ_b	$\Lambda - l$		$1.05^{+0.12}_{-0.11} \pm 0.09$	$1.26^{+0.16}_{-0.15} \pm 0.07$	$1.13^{+0.30+0.05}_{-0.23-0.08}$
Λ_b	$\Lambda_c - l$		$1.06^{+0.40}_{-0.27} \pm 0.07$		$1.33^{+0.71+0.08}_{-0.42-0.09}$
Λ_b	$p - l$				$1.28^{+0.35+0.11}_{-0.29-0.12}$
Ξ_b^0	$\Xi - l$				$1.5^{+0.7}_{-0.4} \pm 0.3$

1. B^- and $\bar{B}^0$ lifetimes

The best statistical precision in the determination of exclusive lifetimes is obtained from measurements using lepton-particle correlations. For example, a sample of B^0 candidates can be obtained from events with lepton-D^{*+} correlations of the correct sign which originate from the decay $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\ell^-\nu$, $D^{*+} \to D^0\pi^+$ and $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ (see Fig. 10 (b) for the method and Fig. 11 for the CDF results). The pion from the strong decay and the lepton form a detached vertex. This information combined with the direction of the reconstructed D^0 meson determines the location of the B decay vertex from which the decay length can be measured. For a LEP experiment the $D^{(*)}\ell$ sample typically contains $\mathcal{O}(100)$ events. To obtain the lifetime from the decay length, requires knowledge of the $\gamma\beta$ factor which is estimated from the momenta of the observed decay products. Since the neutrino is not observed, a correction is made in the boost factor. The uncertainty in the size of this correction is included in the systematic error and is typically of order 3%. Another systematic problem is the contamination from decays $B^- \to D^{**}\ l^-\nu$, followed by $D^{**} \to D^{*+}\pi^-$ where the π^- from the strong decay of the D^{**} (p-wave) meson is not detected. These backgrounds will lead to a B^- meson contamination in the $\bar{B}^0$ lifetime sample (and vice-versa). Since the branching fractions for such decays are poorly measured, this is another

important systematic limitation and gives a contribution of order 5% to the systematic error. Significant contributions to the systematic error also result from the uncertainty in the level of background and its lifetime spectrum. A detailed discussion of exclusive lifetime measurements can be found in a recent review by Sharma and Weber [49].

The systematic problems associated with the boost correction and the contamination from poorly measured backgrounds can be avoided by using fully reconstructed decays such as $\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\pi^-$ or $B^- \to \psi K^-$. However, since exclusive B branching ratios are small, this method has much poorer statistical precision. In hadron collider experiments, this approach has been successfully used to determine the $\bar{B}^0$, B^-, and B_s lifetimes from exclusive modes with ψ mesons e.g. $\bar{B}^0 \to \psi K^{*0}$, $B^- \to \psi K^-$ [89] and $B_s \to \psi\phi$ [90].

A topological vertexing method has been used by the DELPHI experiment. Candidate $\bar{B}^0$ and B^+ mesons are distinguished on the basis of the net charge of the tracks at the decay vertex. This method has small statistical errors however care must be taken to assure that systematic uncertainties from mistracking and incorrect assignments of decay vertices are controlled. The neutral B lifetime that is extracted is an average over the lifetimes over all neutral b flavored hadrons including B_d^0, B_s^0, and Λ_b^0. With good knowledge of the production fractions, the exclusive B^0 lifetime can be extracted.

A topological vertexing technique has also been used by the Fermilab fixed target experiment E653 [37], which has observed 11 charged B candidates and 17 neutral B candidates in their emulsion data. They find $\tau_{B^+} = 3.25^{+1.50+0.27}_{-0.90-0.10}$ ps and $\tau_{B^0} = 0.91^{+0.27+0.10}_{-0.20-0.04}$ ps. These results have been omitted from the determination of world average lifetimes.

Using the procedure for averaging measurements described in Section III F 4, we combine the individual B^- and $\bar{B}^0$ lifetime measurements and obtain

$$\tau_{B^-} \;=\; 1.646 \,\pm\, 0.063 \text{ ps}$$

and

$$\tau_{\bar{B}^0} \;=\; 1.621 \,\pm\, 0.067 \text{ ps}$$

When averaging the results obtained by studying $D - \ell$ correlations a common systematic error of 3% has been assumed.

2. B_s lifetime measurements

The B_s lifetime was measured by CDF [90] and the LEP experiments using partial reconstruction of the semileptonic decay $\bar{B}_s^0 \to D_s^- \ell^+ \nu$. Candidate D_s^- mesons were reconstructed in the $\phi\pi^-$ or $K^{*0}K^-$ final states. Fig. 12(a) shows the $K^-K^+\pi^+$ invariant mass spectrum obtained by ALEPH [95] for right-sign and wrong-sign $D_s\ell$ combinations. This spectrum contains 47 D_s candidates which were used for the lifetime measurement. The B_s decay length was measured and converted to the B_s proper time using a B_s momentum estimator based on the reconstructed lepton and the D_s momentum as well as an estimated neutrino energy obtained by using a missing mass technique. D_s backgrounds from D_s^* decays were treated using a Monte Carlo simulation. The B_s lifetime was extracted from the proper time distribution using a maximum likelihood fit. The result of such a procedure is shown in Fig. 12(b).

FIG. 12. B_s lifetime measurement by ALEPH. a) $K^-K^+\pi^+$ invariant mass distribution for right-sign $D_s^+\ell^-$ combinations. b) $K^-K^+\pi^+$ invariant mass distribution for wrong-sign $D_s^+\ell^+$ combinations. c) Proper time distribution of the right-sign $D_s^+\ell^-$ sample. d) Proper time distribution of the combinatorial background.

A recent CDF result [90] also uses D_s-lepton correlations as well as exclusive reconstruction of $B_s \to \psi\phi$ decays to extract the B_s lifetime [90].

The uncertainty in the B_s lifetime is still dominated by the statistical error. Assuming a common systematic error of 2% [49] for the uncertainty in the vertex resolution and the neutrino energy estimate we obtain

$$\tau_{B_s} \;=\; 1.55 \pm 0.13 \text{ ps}$$

3. b baryon lifetime measurements

Studies of $\Lambda_c^+\ell^-$ and $\Lambda\ell^-$ correlations at LEP provided the first evidence for the production of the Λ_b baryon. Using the decay chain

$$\begin{array}{l} \Lambda_b \to \Lambda_c^+\ell^-\bar{\nu} \\ \qquad \hookrightarrow \Lambda X \\ \qquad\quad \hookrightarrow p\pi^- \end{array}$$

OPAL [96] found the invariant $p\pi^-$ mass distribution shown in Fig. 13(a). Although the composition of the b baryon sample is not known, it is expected that the Λ_b baryon is the most copiously produced. The production of Ξ_b and Ω_b baryons is suppressed due to the additional strange quarks required for their formation. Both impact parameter and decay

FIG. 13. Λ_b lifetime measurement by OPAL. a) $p\pi^-$ invariant mass distribution for right-sign and wrong-sign $\Lambda\ell$ combinations. b) Decay length distribution of the right-sign $\Lambda\ell^-$ sample. The inset shows the corresponding distribution for the wrong-sign $\Lambda\ell^+$ candidates.

length measurements are used to determine τ_{Λ_b}. Since the Λ_c^+ lifetime is short, the Λ_b decay length can be estimated using the $\Lambda\ell^-$ vertex. The resulting time distribution from the OPAL analysis is shown in Fig. 13(b).

A better estimate of the Λ_b decay point is obtained from fully reconstructing the Λ_c^+ baryon and finding the $\Lambda_c^+\ell^-$ vertex. However, the sample sizes become very small. Using this method, DELPHI finds $\tau_{\Lambda_b} = 1.33^{+0.71}_{-0.42} \pm 0.13$ ps. Combining the results listed in Table VII we determine the world average Λ_b lifetime to be

$$\tau_{\Lambda_b} = 1.17 \pm 0.09 \text{ ps.}$$

DELPHI [54] has searched for $\Xi^-\ell^-$ correlations and found 10 Ξ_b candidates. These are expected to come from $\Xi_b^- \to \Xi_c^0\ell^-\bar{\nu}X$ and $\Xi_b^0 \to \Xi_c^+\ell^-\bar{\nu}X$ followed by $\Xi_x \to \Xi^-X'$. A simple average of the proper time of the 10 candidates gives the Ξ_b lifetime estimate of $1.5^{+0.7}_{-0.4} \pm 0.3$ ps.

4. Lifetime Ratios

The ratio of the B^- and $\bar{B^0}$ lifetimes has been measured by a number of experiments. These measurements are performed either by using correlations between D mesons and leptons or by using exclusive final states such as $B^- \to \psi K^-$ and $\bar{B^0} \to \psi K^{*0}$. The CLEO II experiment has measured $\mathcal{B}(B^0 \to X\ l^-\nu)$ and $\mathcal{B}(B^- \to X\ l^-\nu)$ using the yield of leptons found opposite fully and partially reconstructed B decays [114]. From isospin invariance, the ratio of the two branching fractions is the ratio of the lifetimes. Averaging the results listed in Table VIII we obtain

$$\frac{\tau_{B^-}}{\tau_{\bar{B}^0}} = 0.995 \pm 0.068$$

TABLE VIII. Measurements of lifetime ratios for b flavored hadrons.

Method	CDF	ALEPH	OPAL	DELPHI	CLEO II
$D-l$	$1.01 \pm 0.19 \pm 0.17$	$1.00^{+0.14}_{-0.13} \pm 0.08$	$0.94 \pm 0.12 \pm 0.07$	$1.11^{+0.55}_{-0.39} \pm 0.11$	
excl	$1.02 \pm 0.16 \pm 0.05$	$1.11^{+0.31}_{-0.25} \pm 0.03$			
topol.				$1.02^{+0.13+0.13}_{-0.10-0.10}$	
B tags					$0.93 \pm 0.18 \pm 0.12$

Note that this value is not exactly equal to the ratio of the world averages for the B^- and $\bar{B}^0$ lifetimes since the average value of $\tau_{B^-}/\tau_{\bar{B}^0}$ is calculated directly from the ratios reported by the experiments.

I. Lifetime Summary

A summary of the measurements of all the b hadron lifetimes can be found in Fig. 14. The pattern of measured lifetimes follows the theoretical expectations outlined in the introduction to this chapter. However, the Λ_b meson lifetime is unexpectedly short. Scaling from the observed $\Lambda_c - D^0$ lifetime difference, τ_{Λ_b} should not deviate from the average b lifetime by more than 10%. A more precise determination of this lifetime would be of great interest.

FIG. 14. Summary of exclusive b lifetime measurements.

Assuming a $Z \rightarrow B^-$, $\bar{B}^0$, B_s, Λ_b production ratio of 0.39 : 0.39 : 0.12 : 0.10 we can average the exclusive lifetime measurements and find $< \tau_{excl.} > = 1.58 \pm 0.08$ ps; consistent with the inclusive b lifetime, $\tau_b = 1.524 \pm 0.027$ ps. Further improvements in the

determination of b lifetimes can be expected as the data samples available at the TEVATRON increase and from reduced systematic errors in the $D^{(*)}\ell$ correlation measurements at LEP.

IV. SEMILEPTONIC B MESON DECAYS

Semileptonic transitions are the simplest B decays: the heavy b quark decays to either a c or an u quark and the virtual W boson becomes a lepton pair. These decays are described by the external spectator diagram shown in Fig. 1(a), (c). Measurements of semileptonic B decays are used to determine the weak couplings $|V_{cb}|$ and $|V_{ub}|$. In addition, detailed measurements of these decays test models of the dynamics of heavy quark decay. The leptonic current can be calculated exactly while corrections due to the strong interaction are restricted to the $b \to c$ and $b \to u$ vertices, respectively.

Experimentally, semileptonic decays have the advantage of large branching ratios and the characteristic signature of the energetic charged lepton. The neutrino, however, escapes undetected so a full reconstruction of the decaying B meson is impossible. Various techniques which take advantage of production at threshold or the hermiticity of the detector have been developed by the ARGUS, CLEO and LEP experiments to overcome this difficulty.

Semileptonic decays are also useful for the study of other phenomena in B physics. The charge of the lepton in a semileptonic decay is directly correlated with the flavor of the B meson. A negative lepton comes only from the decay of a b quark while the decay of a $\bar{b}$ anti-quark yields positive leptons. Tagging the b flavor has been essential to the discovery of $B^0\bar{B}^0$ oscillations and will be equally important in searches for CP violation in the B system.

We begin with inclusive measurements and then discuss the results on exclusive $b \to c$ transitions. The dynamics of semileptonic decays is considered in the following section in which results on polarization and form factor measurements are given. Both inclusive and exclusive measurements of semileptonic decays of B mesons have been used to determine $|V_{cb}|$. We summarize these results in Section IV D. In the final section, inclusive and exclusive $b \to u$ transitions and the extraction of the CKM element $|V_{ub}|$ are discussed.

A. Inclusive Semileptonic b→ c Transitions

There are three types of measurements of inclusive semileptonic B decays. These are measurements of the inclusive single lepton momentum spectrum, measurements of dilepton events using charge and angular correlations, and measurements of the separate B^- and $\bar{B}^0$ branching ratios by using events which contain a lepton and a reconstructed B meson.

Measurements of the semileptonic B branching ratio, $\mathcal{B}_{sl}$, have been performed on the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance and at higher energies by the PEP, PETRA and LEP experiments. In all cases, the branching fraction of semileptonic decays is determined from the inclusive lepton yield. The primary difficulty in these analyses is distinguishing between leptons from B decay and leptons from other sources. Once the fraction of direct or primary $b \to c\ell\nu$ leptons is obtained, the semileptonic branching ratio is extracted from the integral over the momentum distribution.

1. Measurements of $\mathcal{B}_{sl}$ on the $\Upsilon(4S)$

The momentum spectrum of electrons and muons from B decays as measured by the CLEO II collaboration [97] is shown in Fig. 15. It cuts off at the kinematical limit around 2.4 GeV. Leptons from continuum e^+e^- annihilation and other background sources such as $\psi \to \ell^+\ell^-$ decays have been subtracted. Corrections for final state radiation have been applied to the electron spectrum following the prescription by Atwood and Marciano [103]. The electron spectrum is measured down to momenta of 0.5 GeV while the muon detection system is fully efficient at about 1.4 GeV. Using similar techniques, measurements of the inclusive semileptonic branching fraction have also been published by the ARGUS [104], CRYSTAL BALL [105], CUSB [106], and CLEO 1.5 [107] experiments.

The spectrum in Fig. 15 contains two components: primary leptons from direct semileptonic decays (*i.e.* $b \to c\ell\nu$) and leptons from cascade decays, $b \to cX,\ c \to s\ell\nu$. The experimental challenge is to separate the two so that the inclusive semileptonic branching fraction can be determined from the direct component. Several methods have been devised to accomplish this. These include measurements of the inclusive single lepton momentum spectrum together with a model of semileptonic decays and measurements of dilepton events using charge and angular correlations. Separate B^- and $\bar{B}^0$ branching ratios have been determined using events which contain a lepton and a reconstructed B meson.

In the single lepton analyses, the primary difficulty is separating the contributions from direct semileptonic decay (i.e. $b \to c\ l\ \nu$) and cascade semileptonic decays, $b \to c\ X,\ c \to s\ l\ \nu$. If only leptons above 1.4 GeV are considered, then there is a negligible contribution from cascade decays, which have a soft spectrum, but a large extrapolation to lower momenta is then required to obtain the branching ratio. If the full lepton momentum range is used, then the spectrum after background subtraction must be fitted to the sum of the two components. The shape of the cascade component is obtained by convoluting the measured $B \to DX$ momentum distribution with the experimental $D \to l\ Y$ spectrum [108]. The shape of the primary spectrum is taken from a model of semileptonic B decay. Since the two components are not orthogonal, the separation of background from cascade decays introduces a significant model dependence in the determination of the semileptonic branching ratio.

Two classes of models are used to parameterize the shape of the primary $b \to c\ell\nu$ contribution. Parton models, such as the ACCMM model [109], assume a Gaussian smearing in momentum space for the parton in the meson, and leave the Fermi momentum of the b quark and the charm quark mass as free parameters to be determined by the data. The model of ISGW [110] is an example of the second class. These models are called exclusive models since here the $b \to c\ell\nu$ transition is described as the sum of $B \to D\ell\nu$, $B \to D^*\ell\nu$ and $B \to D^{**}\ell\nu$ channels. The form factors and rate for each channel are calculated using a simple quark model [110].

A fit to the lepton spectrum for muons and electrons from the CLEO II experiment using the ACCMM model is shown in Fig 15(a). The ACCMM model gives a good fit to the data while the ISGW model gives a fit with a somewhat poor χ^2/dof. The CLEO II experiment chooses to remedy this defect of the exclusive model (as did CLEO 1.5) by fixing the ratio of the vector to pseudoscalar contributions and allowing the normalization of the $B \to D^{**}\ell\nu$ component to float in the fit. The result is a fit with an improved χ^2/dof and with the fraction $B \to D^{**}\ell\nu/b \to c\ell\nu$ determined to be $21.2 \pm 1.6 \pm 8.0\%$. This result will be

FIG. 15. CLEO II measurement of the inclusive lepton yield from B decays. a) Fit to the lepton momentum spectrum for muons and electrons using the ACCMM model. b) Fit to the lepton momentum spectrum for muons and electrons using the modified ISGW model with the D^{**} fraction allowed to float.

compared in section IV B to other methods of measuring the $B \to D^{**}\ell\nu$ branching fraction.

A new measurement technique using events with two leptons was introduced by the ARGUS experiment [111] which significantly reduces the model dependence associated with the subtraction of the cascade component. A high momentum lepton is selected ($p_l > 1.4$ GeV) which tags a primary decay. This primary lepton is then combined with an additional lepton candidate which has a momentum above 0.5 GeV. In the absence of mixing, if the second lepton has the a sign opposite to the tagging lepton it is a primary lepton, while if the second lepton has the same sign as the tag it is a secondary lepton. Since the threshold for muon detection is about 1.4 GeV, dielectrons are used in this technique.

A small background from dileptons which originate from a single B can be removed by using the angular correlation between the leptons. By momentum conservation, dileptons from the same B at the $\Upsilon(4S)$ will be approximately back to back while dileptons from different B's will be uncorrelated (Fig. 16 a). A more refined angular correlation as a function of momentum is used in the CLEO II analysis [112].

Including the effect of mixing gives the following relation between the unlike and like sign spectra and the primary and secondary branching fractions ($\frac{\mathcal{B}(b)}{dp}$, $\frac{\mathcal{B}(c)}{dp}$),

$$\frac{dN(\ell^{\pm}e^{\mp})}{dp} = N_{\ell}\epsilon_1(p)\epsilon_2(p)[\frac{d\mathcal{B}(b)}{dp}(1-\chi) + \frac{d\mathcal{B}(c)}{dp}\chi]$$

$$\frac{dN(\ell^{\pm}e^{\pm})}{dp} = N_{\ell}\epsilon_1(p)[\frac{d\mathcal{B}(b)}{dp}\chi + \frac{d\mathcal{B}(c)}{dp}(1-\chi)]$$

Here $\epsilon_1(p)$ is the efficiency of lepton identification, $\epsilon_2(p)$ is the efficiency of the angular correlation cut, χ accounts for $B - \bar{B}$ mixing.

Note that if the second lepton has the opposite charge of the first one, it must be a primary lepton while if second lepton has the same charge it is a cascade lepton. By applying this method it is therefore possible to determine the yield of primary and cascade leptons for each momentum bin. The results of the CLEO II analysis [112], based on a data sample

FIG. 16. Model independent analysis of the dielectron momentum spectrum from the CLEO II experiment: (a) Distribution of the angle between the two leptons in a Monte Carlo simulation. b) The electron momentum spectrum in data. The contributions from primary (filled circles) and secondary electrons (open circles) are shown separately.

of 2.07 fb^{-1} taken on the $\Upsilon(4S)$ and 0.99 fb^{-1} taken just below the resonance, are shown in Fig. 16(b). The measured electron momentum spectrum extends down to 600 MeV and there is only a small extrapolation to zero momentum. The unmeasured part of the spectrum amounts to only $5.8 \pm 0.5\%$ of the total semileptonic rate and hence the model dependence is small. A correction has to be applied for the small contamination of cascade leptons with momenta above 1.4 GeV ($\approx 2.8\%$).

Once the leptons from B decays have been isolated using any of the methods discussed above, the semileptonic branching ratio is determined by integrating over the $b \to c\ell\nu$ momentum spectrum. The results for the single lepton measurements and for the dilepton analyses are given in Tables IX and X.

CLEO II finds

$$\mathcal{B}_{sl} \;=\; (10.36 \,\pm\, 0.17 \,\pm\, 0.40)\,\%$$

where the systematic error includes the uncertainties in the electron identification efficiency, tracking efficiency, and the $B^0\bar{B}^0$ mixing rate. The small model dependence introduced

when extrapolating from 0.5 GeV to zero momentum is determined by comparing the results obtained using the ACCMM and ISGW models and is included in the quoted systematic error.

TABLE IX. Inclusive semileptonic branching ratios in [%] determined from an analysis of the yield of single leptons (1ℓ).

Experiment	ACCMM	ISGW	ISGW**
ARGUS (1 ℓ)	$10.2 \pm 0.5 \pm 0.2$	9.8 ± 0.5	
CRYSTAL BALL (1 ℓ)	$12.0 \pm 0.5 \pm 0.7$	$11.9 \pm 0.4 \pm 0.7$	
CUSB II (1 ℓ)	$10.0 \pm 0.4 \pm 0.3$	$10.0 \pm 0.4 \pm 0.3$	
CLEO 1.5 (1 ℓ)	$10.5 \pm 0.2 \pm 0.4$	$9.9 \pm 0.1 \pm 0.4$	$11.2 \pm 0.3 \pm 0.4$
CLEO II (1 ℓ)	$10.65 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.33$	$10.41 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.33$	$10.87 \pm 0.10 \pm 0.33$
Average (1 ℓ)	10.51 ± 0.21	10.21 ± 0.20	10.98 ± 0.28

TABLE X. Inclusive semileptonic branching ratios in [%] determined using dilepton events (2ℓ) which has less statistical power but much reduced model dependence.

Experiment	$\mathcal{B}_{sl}$
ARGUS (2 ℓ)	$9.1 \pm 0.5 \pm 0.4$
CLEO II (2 ℓ)	$10.36 \pm 0.17 \pm 0.40$
Average (2 ℓ)	9.96 ± 0.36

The results obtained from the dilepton method are consistent with the results obtained using the single lepton technique and show that there is no large systematic problem associated with the subtraction of the cascade component.

Unlike the single lepton measurement, the measurement using the dilepton technique does not require the assumption that the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance always decays to pairs of B mesons. The agreement between the CLEO II results for the dilepton analysis and the single lepton result can also be used to constrain possible non-$B\bar{B}$ decays of the $\Upsilon(4S)$. The 95% confidence level upper limit on the fraction of these uncoventional decays is 0.05 [112].

The dilepton method also gives a measurement of the cascade electron spectrum. This can be compared to the ACCMM and ISGW models and the earlier DELCO [108] measurement of the D semileptonic momentum spectrum. CLEO II finds $\mathcal{B}(b \to c \to se\nu) = (7.7 \pm 0.3 \pm 1.2)\%$ using the ACCMM model and $(8.3 \pm 0.3 \pm 1.2)\%$ for the ISGW model. Within errors, these results are consistent with the expectations, and with the CLEO II single lepton measurement.

2. The semileptonic branching fractions of the B^- and $\bar{B}^0$ mesons

The semileptonic branching fractions reported so far are truly inclusive in the sense that no attempt is made to distinguish different B meson flavors. Separate semileptonic branching fractions for charged and neutral B mesons, $\mathcal{B}(B^0 \to X\ell^-\nu)$ and $\mathcal{B}(B^- \to X\ell^-\nu)$ have been determined by measuring the lepton yield in events with fully or partly reconstructed B

mesons. Measurements of $\mathcal{B}(B^0 \to X\ell^-\nu)$ were reported by the CLEO 1.5 and ARGUS experiments [107], [113]. Simultaneous measurement of the separate branching fractions has been accomplished by CLEO II using its large sample of reconstructed B mesons [114]. In the CLEO II analysis [115], [116], neutral B mesons are reconstructed using the modes $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{(*)+}\pi^-$, $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{(*)+}\rho^-$, $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{(*)+}a_1^-$, $\bar{B}^0 \to \psi K^{(*)0}$, and partially reconstructed $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\ell^-\nu$ and $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^-$ yielding a total of 8456 ± 152 $\bar{B}^0$ tags. The modes $B^- \to D^{(*)0}\pi^-$ $B^- \to D^{(*)0}\rho^-$ $B^- \to D^{(*)0}a_1^-$, and $B^- \to \psi K^{(*)-}$ are used to reconstruct 834 ± 42 charged B mesons. The yield of leptons above background for momenta above

TABLE XI. Measurements of the B^0 and B^+ Semileptonic Branching Fractions [%].

Experiment	$\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to X\ell^-\nu)$	$\mathcal{B}(B^- \to X\ell^-\nu)$
CLEO 1.5 [107]	$9.9 \pm 3.0 \pm 0.9$	
ARGUS [113]	$9.3 \pm 1.1 \pm 1.15$	
CLEO II [114]	$10.9 \pm 0.7 \pm 1.1$	$10.1 \pm 1.8 \pm 1.4$
Average	10.2 ± 1.0	$10.1 \pm 1.8 \pm 1.4$

1.4 GeV in the $\bar{B}^0$ and B^- samples is extrapolated to zero momentum using the ISGW** model [110]. A correction is then applied for $B - \bar{B}$ mixing. This leads to the measurements of branching fractions given in Table XI. These measurements confirm, albeit with lower statistical precision, the other experimental indications that $\mathcal{B}(B \to Xl\nu) < 12.5\%$, the theoretical lower bound.

3. Measurements of $\mathcal{B}_{sl}$ on the Z^0 Resonance

The LEP experiments have determined the semileptonic b branching fraction using dilepton events. Single lepton events could be used if Standard Model Z couplings were assumed. A b-enriched sample is prepared by selecting events containing a lepton with large transverse momentum, $p_\perp$. The semileptonic branching fraction $\mathcal{B}_{sl}$ is then extracted by simultaneously fitting the lepton momentum and $p_\perp$ distributions. The shape of the $B \to X\ell\nu$ spectrum is taken from the $\Upsilon(4S)$ measurements which causes the LEP results to suffer similar model dependence. The LEP results are summarized in Table XII [117], [118], [119], [120]. The second systematic error quoted in the individual measurements is from model dependence. The average value of $\mathcal{B}_{sl} = 11.3 \pm 0.3 \pm 0.4\%$ is consistent with the results from CLEO and ARGUS.

TABLE XII. branching fractions(%) for inclusive semileptonic b decay from LEP.

Experiment	Branching Fraction
ALEPH	$11.40 \pm 0.33 \pm 0.37 \pm 0.20$
OPAL	$10.5 \pm 0.6 \pm 0.4 \pm 0.4$
DELPHI	$11.41 \pm 0.45 \pm 0.50 \pm 0.31$
L3	$11.73 \pm 0.48 \pm 0.28 \pm 0.31$
LEP Average	$11.3 \pm 0.3 \pm 0.4$

Assuming the semileptonic decay width is the same for all b flavored hadrons, the semileptonic branching ratio should be slightly different at LEP since other b-particles are produced:

$$\mathcal{B}_{sl}(\Upsilon(4S)) \;=\; \frac{\Gamma_{sl}}{\Gamma_{tot}} \;=\; \Gamma_{sl} \times \frac{(\tau_{B^+} + \tau_{B^0})}{2}$$

while

$$\mathcal{B}_{sl}(Z^0) \;=\; \Gamma_{sl} \times \tau_b$$

Using the world averages for lifetimes determined earlier this gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{B}_{sl}(Z^0) &= \frac{2\tau_b}{(\tau_{B^+} + \tau_{B^0})} \times \mathcal{B}_{sl}(\Upsilon(4S)) \\ &= 9.77 \pm 0.37\%\end{aligned}$$

Note that the contribution of other hadrons *reduces* the expected average semileptonic branching fraction at the Z^0. This prediction is below the experimental average from LEP but the errors are still too large to draw any significant conclusions.

4. Measurement of $b \to X\tau\nu$

The branching fraction for $B \to X\tau\nu^-$ has been measured by several LEP experiments by using the $\tau \to$ hadron $\bar{\nu}$ decay mode and the large missing energy which is characteristic of this decay mode [136], [137], [138]. After applying standard selection procedures for $Z \to b\bar{b}$ decays events containing electrons or muons are rejected in order to remove conventional semileptonic B decays. Comparing the remaining data with a detailed Monte Carlo simulation, which does not include $B \to X\tau\nu$ decays, yields an excess from which the branching fraction is determined to be

$$\mathcal{B}(B \to X\tau\nu) \;=\; 2.75 \pm 0.30 \pm 0.37\,\% \;\;,\; \text{ALEPH}$$

$$\mathcal{B}(B \to X\tau\nu) \;=\; 2.4 \pm 0.7 \pm 0.8\,\% \;\;,\; \text{L3}$$

These measurements are consistent with the Standard Model expectation of 2.3±0.25% [140], [139]. The measurement of $B \to X\ \tau\ \nu$ imposes the constraint $\tan\beta < 0.4 \times m_H/\text{GeV}$ at the 90% confidence level on (model II) charged Higgs which occur in various extensions of the Standard Model including the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM) [137]. The $B \to X\tau\nu$ mode is difficult to isolate at threshold experiments because of the overlap with decay products from the second B and the low energy of the final state lepton/hadron from the τ decay.

B. Exclusive Semileptonic Transitions.

The determination of Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa matrix elements is one of the central experimental problems in heavy quark physics. The inclusive semileptonic branching ratio discussed in the previous section can be used to determine the element $|V_{cb}|$ and the measurements are now quite precise with experimental uncertainty below the 5 % level. However,

the conversion of the resulting semileptonic width to $|V_{cb}|$ has a fairly large theoretical uncertainty. Estimates of this uncertainty range from 5% to 15%. By contrast, it is possible that measurements of exclusive semileptonic modes can be used to extract $|V_{cb}|$ with smaller theoretical uncertainty. In the following sections we will summarize the results obtained for the decays $B \to D\ell\nu$, $B \to D^*\ell\nu$ and $B \to D^{**}\ell\nu$.

1. Measurements of $\mathcal{B}(B \to D^*\ell\nu)$

The mode $B \to D^*\ell\nu$ is preferred experimentally to the mode $B \to D\ell\nu$ since the addition of the D^* constraint allows the isolation of a large and clean experimental signal. ARGUS, CLEO 1.5, CLEO II, and ALEPH have reported signals in $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\ell^-\nu$ with $D^* \to D^0\pi^+$ and $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$. CLEO II can also observe the decay chain $B^- \to D^{*0}\ell^-\nu$ with $D^* \to D^0\pi^0$. In threshold experiments, the pion from the D^* decay has a momentum below 225 MeV in the laboratory and is often referred to as the slow pion (denoted π_s). For the lower portion of the momentum range accessible to the slow pion, the large curvature of the track in the high magnetic field and the multiple orbits of its trajectory complicate track reconstruction. It is possible to reconstruct slow neutral pions, however, the combinatorial background is larger. For high energy experiments, the charged slow pion is boosted so that there is full acceptance for the entire momentum range.

In the decay of the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance, B mesons are produced in pairs with momenta of about 330 MeV. The signals at ARGUS and CLEO are isolated using the kinematic constraints from production at threshold. The effective mass of the neutrino in the decay $B \to D^*\ell\nu$ is given by

$$m_\nu^2 = (E_B - E_{D^*l})^2 - |p_B|^2 - |P_{D^*l}|^2 + 2|p_B||p_{D^*L}|\cos\Theta$$

where (E_B, p_B) is the B meson 4-momentum, (E_{D^*l}, p_{D^*l}) is the sum of the D^* and lepton 4-momenta, and Θ is the angle between the 3-momenta p_{D^*l} and p_B. The first three terms in the expression for m_ν^2 are the missing mass squared, denoted MM^2. The factor multiplying cosΘ will be denoted C. Since the direction of the B momentum cannot be measured, a common approximation is to set $|p_B| = 0$ in the above expression and then substitute the precisely known beam energy, E_{beam} for E_B. Then, the missing mass squared becomes

$$MM^2 = (E_{beam} - E_{D^*l})^2 - |P_{D^*l}|^2$$

and the signal will peak at $MM^2 = 0$ with a width determined by the B momentum. A variety of methods have been used to measure the signal yield. The ARGUS experiment which first isolated a signal in $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}l^-\nu$, measured the excess in the background subtracted MM^2 distribution. Their fit allows for contributions from $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\ell^-\nu$ and $\bar{B} \to D^{**}\ell^-\nu$, $D^{**} \to D^{*+}(\pi)$. The CLEO 1.5 experiment also used this method.

The CLEO II experiment has chosen a different technique to determine the $\bar{B} \to D^*\ell\nu$ branching fraction which uses slightly more of the available information. For lepton momenta above 1.4 GeV, correctly reconstructed $B \to D^*\ell\nu$ decays must lie in a triangular region in the plane of MM^2 and C. A cut on the D^*-D mass difference is imposed, and the D^0 invariant mass spectrum (shown in Figure 17) is fitted to extract the number of B candidates. The

largest background is due to combinations of incorrectly reconstructed D^*s and real leptons. This background is subtracted using the sidebands of the $D^* - D$ mass difference. There is also a small background from uncorrelated combinations of correctly reconstructed D^*s and leptons, which can be estimated from data. A small correction for background from non-resonant processes (continuum) and misidentified leptons is also included. The resulting

FIG. 17. CLEO II D^0 mass distributions for (a) $\bar{B^0} \to D^{*+}\ell^-\nu$ candidates and (b) $B^- \to D^{*0}\ell^-\nu$ candidates.

signal yield is due to $B \to D^*(X)\ell\nu$ events. After removing all backgrounds, CLEO II finds $376 \pm 27 \pm 16$ $\bar{B^0} \to D^{*+}\ell^-\nu$ events and $302 \pm 32 \pm 13$ $B^- \to D^{*0}\ell^-\nu$ events as shown in Figure 17. This sample is also used to evaluate $|V_{cb}|$ using the HQET inspired method (see section IV D 3).

Larger event samples and significantly better statistical precision can be obtained using a partial reconstruction technique as demonstrated by the ARGUS analysis of $B \to D^{*+}\ell\nu$. In this case, only the low momentum pion from the D^{*+} decay and the lepton are detected. The momentum of the undetected D^0 meson can be deduced from the direction of the slow pion and kinematic constraints. The momentum of the D^* meson is approximately $\alpha p_\pi + \beta$, where α and β are constants which can be determined from Monte Carlo (also see discussion in section V A). The signal yield is determined using a modified form of MM^2 with the estimated D^* direction replacing the measured D^* direction in the expression above. The systematic error from background subtraction, which is estimated using the wrong sign sample, must be evaluated with care.

By comparing the branching ratios for $\bar{B^0} \to D^{*+}\ell^-\nu$ and $B^- \to D^{*0}\ell^-\nu$ and using measurements of the ratio of lifetimes from collider experiments, CLEO II obtains the ratio of the production of B^+B^- and $B^0\bar{B^0}$ meson pairs at the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance, $f_+/f_0 = 1.04 \pm 0.13(stat) \pm 0.12(sys) \pm 0.10$ (lifetime ratio). This confirms to an accuracy of about 15% the initial assumption that the production of charged and neutral B meson pairs are equal. The

TABLE XIII. Measurements of branching fractions(%) for exclusive semileptonic B decay with a D or D^* in the final state. The symbol † indicates the branching ratio for this mode was measured using a partial reconstruction technique. Due to the complexity of the analysis procedure, those measurements marked with a * cannot be renormalized to take into account the new values of the D and D^* branching fractions.

Mode	CLEO 1.5	ARGUS	CLEO II	ALEPH
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\ell^-\nu$	$4.1 \pm 0.5 \pm 0.7$	$4.7 \pm 0.6 \pm 0.6$	$4.49 \pm 0.32 \pm 0.39$	$5.36 \pm 0.50 \pm 0.76$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\ell^-\nu$		$4.5 \pm 0.3 \pm 0.4$ †		
$B^- \to D^{*0}l^-\nu$	$4.1 \pm 0.8^{+0.8}_{-0.9}$ *	$6.8 \pm 1.6 \pm 1.5$	$5.13 \pm 0.54 \pm 0.64$	
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\ell^-\nu$	$1.8 \pm 0.6 \pm 0.3$ *	$2.1 \pm 0.7 \pm 0.6$		
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^0\ell^-\nu$	$1.6 \pm 0.6 \pm 0.3$ *	$1.4 \pm 0.6 \pm 0.5$ *		

small value of the $B^+ - B^0$ mass difference, 0.2 ± 0.3 MeV, discussed in Section III A also supports this conclusion.

At LEP, the kinematic constraints from production at threshold are not available. However, the B direction can be measured from the vector between the production point and the detached vertex from the B decay. The decay products of the two B hadrons are cleanly separated into jets. In addition, the neutrino energy can be crudely determined from a missing energy measurement. These features have allowed ALEPH to measure the $\bar{B}^0 \to D^* l\nu$ branching fraction [129].

The dominant systematic error in the threshold experiments is due to the uncertainty in the slow pion detection efficiencies while ALEPH and the LEP experiments are limited by the sizeable uncertainty in the number of B mesons produced in Z^0 decay which is used for the normalization of the branching fraction ($\sim 8\%$). The uncertainty from the D^{**} background is much smaller ($\sim 3\%$) [129].

Since the publication of the CLEO 1.5 and ARGUS results, the D and D^* branching ratios have changed significantly. Wherever possible, the published values for semileptonic branching fractions have been rescaled to accommodate the new charm branching fractions. For some results, which are marked with an asterix in Table XIII, insufficient information to perform the rescaling was provided in the original papers. A separate systematic error for the contribution of charm branching fraction is quoted in the world averages.

2. Measurements of $\mathcal{B}(B \to D\ell\nu)$

Measurements of the modes $B^+ \to D^+\ell^-\nu$ and $\bar{B}^0 \to D^0\ell^-\nu$ are experimentally difficult because of the significant combinatorial backgrounds in the $D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+$ and $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ signals and the large backgrounds from the decay chain $B \to D^*\ell\nu$, $D^* \to D(\pi,\gamma)$ as well as $B \to D^{**}\ell\nu$, followed by $D^{**} \to D^*(\pi)$ or $D^* \to D(\pi,\gamma)$ where the π (or γ) from the D^* decay is not reconstructed. The separation of the latter two backgrounds, which yield the same final state particles, is accomplished using their slightly different behaviours as a function of lepton momentum and D momentum. In addition, the presence of an additional pion shifts the center of the missing mass distribution. In some analyses, additional constraints are provided by requiring that the $D^{*(+,0)}\ell\nu$ fraction be consistent

FIG. 18. Distributions from the ALEPH experiment for $\Delta m^* = m_{D^{*+}\pi^-} - m_{D^{*+}}$ for the right sign (a) and wrong sign (b) $D^*\pi$ combinations. The right sign spectrum is fitted to the sum of a Breit-Wigner signal and a background shape.

with the branching fraction from the dedicated exclusive measurement.

3. Measurements of $\mathcal{B}(B \to D^{**}\ell\nu)$

Semileptonic B decay to orbitally excited D states has been searched for at LEP and by the $\Upsilon(4S)$ experiments. For experiments at threshold the background from $B \to D^{**}\ell\nu \to D^*(\pi)\ell\nu$ (where the (π) from the D^{**} decay is not detected) is small and manageable. The background from events with $D^*\ell\nu$ and additional pion(s) in the final state peaks at higher values of MM^2 and has a characteristically soft lepton momentum spectrum. Thus, ARGUS and CLEO 1.5 found that this background could be separated statistically. ARGUS finds a sizeable signal for $B \to D^{**}\ell\nu$, $D^{**} \to D^*(\pi)$ which includes significant resonant $D_1(2420)\ell\nu$ and other resonant modes as well as non-resonant channels. In the recent CLEO II analysis of $\bar{B} \to D^*\ell\nu$, the background from final states with additional pions is determined by examining D^*-lepton combinations with $p(\mathrm{lepton})$ in the range $0.8 - 1.4$ GeV in the portion of C-MM^2 plane which is preferentially populated by $B \to D^{**}X\ell\nu$ decays. CLEO II find a modest excess in this region which corresponds to a model dependent upper limit of $\mathcal{B}(B \to D^{**}X\ell\nu) < 2.8\%$ at the 95 % confidence level.

The use of solid state vertex detectors has allowed the experiments at LEP to isolate signals for $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^- X l\nu$ where the additional charged pion is vertexed with the slow pion from the D^* decay and the lepton. The ALEPH, OPAL, and DELPHI experiments have reported signals [133]; the OPAL results are shown in Figure 19. The quantity plotted

FIG. 19. $D^{(*)}\pi - D^{(*)}$ mass difference distributions from OPAL for a) $D^{*+}\pi^-$ combinations, b) $D^+\pi^-$ combinations, and c) $D^0\pi^-$ combinations.

it the mass difference between the $D^{(*)}\pi$ system and the charmed meson (D^* or D) which has a better experimental resolution than could be obtained from the $D^{(*)}\pi$ invariant mass distribution. Both ALEPH and OPAL have reported measurements of the product $\mathcal{B}(b \to B) \times \mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \to D(2420)X\ell^-\nu) \times \mathcal{B}(D_1(2420) \to D^{*+}\pi^-)$ and quote $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \to D(2420)X\ell^-\nu)$ assuming $\mathcal{B}(b \to B) = 0.37$ and $\mathcal{B}(D_1(2420) \to D^{*+}\pi^-) \sim 0.67$. In addition, OPAL has reported a significant signal for $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \to D_2^*(2470)X\ell^-\nu)$ using $D_2^*(2470) \to D^0\pi^+$. These signals may include X, one or more undetected pions. ALEPH has also performed an inclusive topological measurement which is sensitive to $\bar{B} \to D^{*+}\pi^-\ell^-\nu$ in which the $D^{*+}\pi^-$ system is non-resonant.

The results on semileptonic $B \to D^{**}$ transitions are given in Table XIV. The LEP measurements and the CLEO II upper limit are marginally consistent. The corresponding world averages can be found in Table XV.

These measurements of the production of orbitally excited D mesons in semileptonic decay show that the Shifman-Voloshin (SV) limit, in which the $B \to D\ell\nu$ and $B \to D^*\ell\nu$ channels saturate the semileptonic width, is not achieved [134]. Quark models also predict small rates for the production of p-wave D mesons. For example, the ISGW2 model predicts that about 7% of the total semileptonic rate will occur in channels with excited charmed mesons and $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \to D_1(2420)\ell\nu) \sim 0.25\%$, well below the observed rate [102]. Predictions from the model of Colangelo *et al.* also give rates in the 0.1% range for the largest channels [135].

TABLE XIV. Measurements of branching fractions(%) for exclusive semileptonic B decay with p-wave charmed mesons in the final state. The signal may include X, one or more undetected pions.

Mode	ARGUS	CLEO II	ALEPH	OPAL
$B^- \to D_1^0(2420)\ell^- X\nu$			$0.84 \pm 0.24 \pm 0.14$	$0.81 \pm 0.20 \pm 0.19$
$B^- \to D_2^{*0}(2460)\ell^- X\nu$				$0.35 \pm 0.14 \pm 0.17$
$\bar{B^0} \to D_1^+(2430)\ell^- X\nu$				$0.78 \pm 0.28 \pm 0.18$
$\bar{B^0} \to D_2^{*+}(2470)\ell^- X\nu$				$0.90 \pm 0.27 \pm 0.21$
$\bar{B} \to D^{**}(2420)\ell^- X\nu$			$0.84 \pm 0.24 \pm 0.14$	0.80 ± 0.24
$\bar{B} \to D^{**}(2460)\ell^- X\nu$				0.44 ± 0.14
$\bar{B} \to D^{*+}\pi^-\ell^- X\nu$			$1.08 \pm 0.3 \pm 0.22$	
$\bar{B} \to D^{**}\ell^-\nu$	$2.9 \pm 0.5 \pm 0.5$	$< 2.8\%$(95% C.L.)		

TABLE XV. World average branching fractions(%) for exclusive semileptonic B decay. The modes marked with the symbol † are not included in the sum of exclusive modes as discussed in the text.

Mode	World Average
$\bar{B^0} \to D^{*+}\ell^-\nu$	$4.56 \pm 0.27 \pm 0.25$
$B^- \to D^{*0}l^-\nu$	$5.31 \pm 0.70 \pm 0.41$
$\bar{B^0} \to D^+\ell^-\nu$	$2.1 \pm 0.9 \pm 0.14$
$B^- \to D^0\ell^-\nu$	1.5 ± 0.5 †
$\bar{B} \to D^{**}\ell^-\nu$	$2.9 \pm 0.5 \pm 0.5$ †
$\bar{B} \to D^{**}(2420)\ell^- X\nu$	$0.82 \pm 0.18 \pm 0.06$
$\bar{B} \to D^{**}(2460)\ell^- X\nu$	$0.44 \pm 0.14 \pm 0.03$
Sum of exclusive semileptonic $\mathcal{B}$	8.05 ± 1.7
Inclusive semileptonic $\mathcal{B}$	10.98 ± 0.28

4. Summary of exclusive semileptonic $b \to c$ measurements

Additional exclusive semileptonic channels have been searched for by the ARGUS [143] and L3 collaborations [138]. These include modes which require either $s\bar{s}$ popping at the lower part of the spectator graph [142] or baryon production [143]. No signal was observed

TABLE XVI. Measurements of Other Inclusive Semileptonic Branching Ratios.

Experiment	Mode	B(%)
ARGUS	$B \to D_s X\ell^+\nu$	< 0.9(90% C.L.)
ARGUS	$B \to \bar{p}X\ell^+\nu$	< 0.16(90% C.L.)
L3	$B \to X\nu$	$2.27 \pm 0.8 \pm 1.5$

and the upper limits are summarized in Table XVI.

In Table XV we sum the exclusive semileptonic modes and find a value consistent with the inclusive semileptonic branching ratio. The mode $B^- \to D^0\ell^-\nu$ is omitted since the measurements of this mode cannot be adjusted to account for the changes in D and D^* branching

fractions. The measurement of the mode $B \to D^{**}\ell\nu$ is also omitted from the calculation of the sum of the exclusive modes and instead the measurements of $B \to D^{**}(2420)\ell\nu$ and $B \to D^{**}(2460)\ell\nu$ are used. If the other possible approach is taken and $B \to D^{**}\ell\nu$ is used but $B \to D^{**}(2420)\ell\nu$ and $B \to D^{**}(2460)\ell\nu$ are omitted, then the sum of the exclusive modes becomes 9.4 ± 1.2. The conclusion is the same using either approach.

To determine $\mathcal{B}(B \to D^{**}\ell\nu)$, ARGUS and CLEO II have assumed that the model of ISGW correctly predicts the relative fractions of $B \to D_0^1(2420)\ell\nu$, $B \to D_2^*(2460)\ell\nu$ and the other excited charm mesons. This procedure can be applied to the world average for $\mathcal{B}(B \to D^{**}(2420)\ell\nu)$ which is the most precisely known of these rates for the semileptonic decay to an excited charmed meson, this gives $\mathcal{B}(B \to D^{**}\ell\nu) = 1.64 \pm 0.22 \pm \pm 0.11\%$ which is consistent with the ISGW** fit to the inclusive semileptonic spectrum which gives $\mathcal{B}(B \to D^{**}\ell\nu) = 2.3 \pm 0.9$.

Model dependent extrapolations from the rate of observed $D^{**}\ell\nu$, $D^{**} \to D^*\pi$ decays appear to saturate the remainder of the missing portion of the semileptonic rate. The other remaining decays may correspond to $B \to D^{**}\ell\nu$ where D^{**} denotes a p-wave charmed meson with a large width (e.g. the very broad but as of now unobserved $1^3P_1(2490)$ and $1^3P_0(2440)$ states). It is also possible that the other missing decays are $B \to D\pi\ell^-\nu$ where the $D\pi$ system is non-resonant or originates from the decay of a broad excited charm meson. These possibilities are difficult to check experimentally.

C. The Dynamics of Semileptonic B Decay

Since leptons are not sensitive to the strong interaction, the amplitude for a semileptonic B decay can be factorized into two parts, a leptonic and a hadronic current. The leptonic factor can be calculated exactly while the hadronic part is parameterized by form factors. A simple example is the transition $B \to Dl\nu$. The differential decay rate in this case is given by

$$\frac{d\Gamma}{dq^2} = \frac{G^2}{24\pi^3}|V_{cb}^2|P_D^3 f_+^2(q^2)$$

where q^2 is the mass of the virtual W ($\ell\nu$) and $f_+(q^2)$ is the single vector form factor. The form factor which describes semileptonic decay is analogous to the form factor which arises in electron-nucleon scattering. In this case, the form factor $|f_+(q^2)|^2$ gives the probability that the final state quarks will form a D meson.

The form factor is largest when the initial and final state heavy quarks have the smallest relative velocities, that is at maximum q^2. As q^2 decreases and the momentum transfer increases, the modulus of the form factor decreases.

Since the $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\ell^-\nu$ mode has a large branching ratio and good signal to background ratio, it is experimentally preferred to $\bar{B} \to D\ell\nu$ for form factor studies. Moreover, the theoretical predictions for this mode are thought to be reliable. The corresponding expression for the differential rate in $B \to D^*\ell\nu$ is given in section IV C 2. In this case, there are three form factors which correspond to the three possible partial waves of the $B \to D^*\bar{W}'$ system (here $\bar{W}'$ is the virtual W which becomes the lepton-antineutrino pair).

1. Polarization in $B \to D^* \ell \nu$ decays

In the past, insufficient data was available to perform a measurement of the individual form factors in $B \to D^* \ell \nu$ decay. Various integrated quantities which give information on the form factors were determined.

For example, the polarization α in $B \to D^* \ell \nu$ can be determined by fitting the D^* helicity angle distribution which should be distributed as $1 + \alpha \cos^2 \theta_{D^*}$. It is also possible to measure the forward-backward asymmetry of the lepton in the W rest frame which gives information on the ratio of the positive and negative helicity amplitudes.

TABLE XVII. Measurements of integrated observables in $B \to D^* \ell \nu$ Decays.

Experiment	α	A_{FB}
CLEO 1.5	$0.65 \pm 0.66 \pm 0.25$	
ARGUS	$1.1 \pm 0.4 \pm 0.2$	$0.20 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.06$
CLEO II	$1.48 \pm 0.32 \pm 0.14$	$0.209 \pm 0.034 \pm 0.015$
World average	1.24 ± 0.25	0.208 ± 0.035

These results can be compared, for example, to the prediction of Scora of $\alpha = 1.32$ in the ISGW$'$ model [102] and to the HQET based predictions of Neubert $\alpha = 1.37$ and $A_{FB} = 0.22$. The agreement of A_{FB} in sign and magnitude with quark model predictions has been used to deduce limits on a hypothetical $V + A$ coupling of the b quark [159].

Other tests of models are provided by the vector to pseudoscalar ratio which is, for example, predicted to be 2.6 in the ISGW$'$ model and 2.79 in the HQET based model of Neubert. Experimentally, this is found to be 2.17 ± 0.93 where the large error reflects the poor precision of the $\bar{B}^0 \to D^+ \ell^- \nu$ branching fraction.

The measurements of integrated observables are thus in good agreement with models. Form factor measurements are a more sophisticated approach and provide better discrimination between models. In addition, all the available information is used and hence the statistical precision is improved.

2. Measurement of the $B \to D^* \ell \nu$ Form Factors

The differential decay rate for $B \to D^* \ell \nu$ can be expressed in terms of three q^2-dependent helicity amplitudes $H_\pm(q^2)$ and $H_0(q^2)$, where the subscripts refer to the helicity of either the virtual W ($\ell\nu$) or the D^* [98], [154–157]. The rate is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\Gamma}{dq^2\, d\cos\theta_{\ell\nu}\, d\cos\theta_V\, d\chi} = \frac{3G_F^2 |V_{cb}|^2\, P_{D^*}\, q^2}{8(4\pi)^4 m_B^2} \times \\
\{[(1-\cos\theta_{\ell\nu})^2 |H_+(q^2)|^2 + (1+\cos\theta_{\ell\nu})^2 |H_-(q^2)|^2] \sin^2\theta_V \\
+4\sin^2\theta_{\ell\nu}\cos^2\theta_V |H_0(q^2)|^2 \\
-2\sin^2\theta_{\ell\nu}\sin^2\theta_V \cos(2\chi) H_+(q^2) H_-(q^2) \\
-4\sin\theta_{\ell\nu}(1-\cos\theta_{\ell\nu})\sin\theta_V\cos\theta_V\cos\chi\, H_+(q^2) H_0(q^2) \\
+4\sin\theta_{\ell\nu}(1+\cos\theta_{\ell\nu})\sin\theta_V\cos\theta_V\cos\chi\, H_-(q^2) H_0(q^2)\},
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

FIG. 20. The kinematic variables used in the CLEO II $B \to D^* \ell \nu$ form factor analysis.

where m_B is the mass of B meson, P_{D^*} is the momentum of the D^* and is a function of q^2, and the angles $\theta_{\ell\nu}$, θ_V, and χ are defined in Fig. 20. The helicity amplitudes $H_\pm$ and H_0 can be expressed in terms of two axial-vector form factors, $A_1(q^2)$ and $A_2(q^2)$, and a vector form factor $V(q^2)$:

$$H_\pm(q^2) = (m_B + m_{D^*})A_1(q^2) \mp \frac{2m_B\, P_{D^*}}{(m_B + m_{D^*})}V(q^2)$$
$$H_0(q^2) = \frac{1}{2m_{D^*}\sqrt{q^2}}\Big[(m_B^2 - m_{D^*}^2 - q^2)(m_B + m_{D^*})A_1(q^2) - \frac{4m_B^2\, P_{D^*}^2}{(m_B + m_{D^*})}A_2(q^2)\Big], \tag{9}$$

where m_{D^*} is the mass of the D^* meson.

There are a number of important and simple qualitative features that are present in equation 8. These are most easily seen after integrating over the variable χ, so that the last three terms vanish. The helicity zero (longitudinal) component then has a $\cos^2\theta_{D^*}$ and a $\sin^2\theta_{\ell\nu}$ dependence. The negative and positive helicity components have a $\sin^2\theta_{D^*}$ dependence as well as a $(1+\cos\theta_{\ell\nu})^2$ and $(1-\cos\theta_{\ell\nu})^2$ behaviour, respectively.

As a result of the $V-A$ coupling of the virtual W, the difference between the positive and negative helicity amplitudes, $H_+ - H_-$, is large and negative. This feature can be clearly observed in the scatter plot of χ versus $\cos\theta_{D^*}$ [98].

Other intuitive and useful features (see previous section) can be deduced from consideration of integrated quantities. For instance, A_{FB} is controlled primarily by the form factor ratio $R_2 = V(q^2 = q^2_{max})/A_1(q^2 = q^2_{max})$ and the $\cos\theta_{\ell\nu}$ distribution. The size of the second independent form factor ratio, $R_1 = A_2(q^2 = q^2_{max})/A_1(q^2 = q^2_{max})$ is determined by the $\cos\theta_{D^*}$ distribution and to a fair extent by α, the degree of polarization.

Using the measured values of q^2/q^2_{max}, $\cos\Theta_{D^*}$, $\cos\Theta_{\ell\nu}$ and χ, a 4-dimensional unbinned maximum likelihood fit was performed using a Monte Carlo integration technique in a man-

FIG. 21. The experimental distributions of kinematic variables in data compared to the fit in the CLEO II $B \to D^* \ell \nu$ form factor analysis for: (a) $\cos\theta_{D^*}$ (b) $\cos\theta_{\ell\nu}$ (c) q^2 (d) χ

ner similar to reference [158]. This technique allows a multi-dimensional likelihood fit to be performed to variables modified by experimental acceptance and resolution, and is necessary due to the substantial smearing of the kinematic variables from the motion of the B meson. The basis of the method is to determine the probability density function by using the population of appropriately weighted MC events in the four dimensional kinematic space. This is accomplished by generating one high statistics sample of MC events with a known value of the form factor ratios R_1, R_2 and corresponding known values of the four kinematic variables q^2/q^2_{max}, $\cos\Theta_{D^*}$, $\cos\Theta_W$, and χ for each event. The generated events are then processed through the full detector simulation and analysis chain. Using the generated kinematic variables, the accepted MC events are weighted by the ratio of the decay distribution for the trial values of R_1, R_2 to that of the generated distribution. The accepted MC events are now, therefore, distributed according to the probability density corresponding to the trial values of R_1, R_2. By such weighting, a likelihood may be evaluated for each data event for different values of the form factor ratios, and a fit can be performed. The probability for each event is determined by sampling this distribution using a search volume around each data point. The volume size is chosen so that the systematic effect from finite search volumes is small and the required number of MC events is not prohibitively high [161], [162].

The results of such a measurement from CLEO II are given in Table XVIII. The mea-

surement of the form factor ratios from CLEO II was obtained using a larger dataset and an improved analysis technique and supersedes the result of Ref [159].

In the limit of pure HQET, the form factor ratios are both unity. Including $O(\bar{\Lambda}/m_c)$ corrections gives 1.3 and 0.8 for R_1 and R_2 respectively. The experimental precision on the form factor ratios is not sufficient to distinguish between these two possibilities and the models, which are listed in Table XIX. However, the experimental results do indicate that deviations from the limit of heavy quark symmetry are not large.

For the purposes of comparison between data and models, it should be noted that several of the quark models quoted in Table XIX use a different q^2 dependence for their form factors than is assumed by HQET and by the CLEO II measurement. This will be not a large effect given the small range in q^2 available in the reaction $B \to D^* l\nu$. For instance, the value of A_2/A_1 in HQET varies from 1.35 to 1.27 over the full kinematic range.

TABLE XVIII. Measurements of the form factor ratios in $B \to D^* \ell\nu$ decays at $q^2 = q^2_{max}$.

Experiment	R_1	R_2	ρ^2
CLEO II	$1.30 \pm 0.36 \pm 0.16$	$0.64 \pm 0.26 \pm 0.12$	$1.01 \pm 0.15 \pm 0.09$

TABLE XIX. Predictions for the form factor ratios from theoretical models at $q^2 = q^2_{max}$.

Model	R_1	R_2
HQET (Neubert) [146]	1.35	0.79
Ball [285]	1.31	0.95
ISGW [110]	1.01	0.91
BSW [101]	0.91	0.85
KS [100]	1.09	1.09

D. Determination of $|V_{cb}|$

1. $|V_{cb}|$ from inclusive measurements

The theoretical uncertainty in the determination of $|V_{cb}|$ is currently a matter of active discussion and no clear consensus has emerged. The values of $|V_{cb}|$ determined from the world average for the inclusive semileptonic branching fraction are given in Table XX for different theoretical models. The models predict the decay width in the form $\Gamma \; = \; \gamma_c \cdot |V_{cb}|^2$. The value of $|V_{cb}|$ is then obtained from experiment using

$$|V_{cb}|^2 \; = \; \mathcal{B}(B \to X\ell\nu)/(\tau_B \cdot \gamma_c)$$

One way of reducing the theoretical uncertainty associated with the m_b^5 dependence of the semileptonic width was introduced by Altarelli *et al.* [109]. In their quark model, the spectator quark is assigned a Fermi momentum p_F and has a Gaussian momentum distribution. Each value of p_F gives a slightly different value of m_b, however, the average value of p_F and

m_b as well as the effective spectator quark mass m_{sp} can be determined by fitting the shape of the lepton momentum spectrum. The relationship

$$m_b^2 = m_B^2 + m_{sp}^2 - 2m_B\sqrt{p_F^2 + m_{sp}^2}$$

where m_B is the B meson mass, allows the experimental data to be used to constrain m_b.

Shifman, Uraltsev, and Vainshtein propose that the dependence of the width in the SV (Shifman-Voloshin) [134] limit is proportional to $m_b - m_c$ rather than to m_b^5. This will substantially reduce the uncertainty in the extraction of $|V_{cb}|$ from inclusive decays. Using $m_b = (4.8 \pm 0.1)$ GeV from a QCD sum rule analysis of the Υ system, Shifman *et al.* find on this basis that the theoretical uncertainty in the determination of $|V_{cb}|$ is less than 5% and nearly model independent. In contrast, Neubert asserts that the model dependence in $|V_{cb}|$ is of the order of 10% due to the unknown higher order corrections in the expansion for the semileptonic width in $\alpha_s(m_Q)$, where m_Q is the mass of the heavy quark [147], [148]. The experimental fact that $b \to c\ell\nu$ transitions are far from the SV limit may also affect the reliability of the claim by Shifman *et al.*. Luke and Savage have also investigated the model dependence of $|V_{cb}|$ in a HQET framework and conclude that the determination from the inclusive measurements gives values of $|V_{cb}|$ in the range $0.037 - 0.052$ which corresponds to an uncertainty of order 14%. Using a similar approach with a constraint on m_c obtained from the experimental determination of $\mathcal{B}(D \to X\ell\nu)$, Ball and Nierste find a significantly larger value $\gamma_c = 54.2 \pm 5$ which gives a somewhat lower value of $|V_{cb}|$ [153].

TABLE XX. Determinations of V_{cb} using inclusive semileptonic decays.

Theorist	γ_c	$\lvert V_{cb}\rvert$
ACCMM *et al.* [109]	40 ± 8	$0.0401 \pm 0.001(\text{exp}) \pm .004(\text{theor})$
Shifman *et al.* [151]	41.3 ± 4	$0.03965 \pm 0.001(\text{exp}) \pm .002(\text{theor})$
ISGW** [110]	42 ± 8	$0.0400 \pm 0.001(\text{exp}) \pm .004(\text{theor})$
Ball and Nierste [153]	54.2 ± 5	$0.0344 \pm 0.001(\text{exp}) \pm .002(\text{theor})$

2. $|V_{cb}|$ from exclusive measurements

Using measurements of the B^+ and B^0 lifetimes, and the assumption of isospin invariance, the $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\ell^-\nu$ and $B^- \to D^{*0}\ell^-\nu$ branching fraction measurements can be combined to obtain the width $\Gamma(B \to D^*\ell\nu) = (30.2 \pm 2.6 \pm 1.0)$ ns $^{-1}$ which is independent of the ratio of production fractions f_+/f_0. To allow the results to be rescaled easily, the contribution due to the uncertainty in the average B meson lifetime is separated in the error. This determination of the width can then be translated into a value for $|V_{cb}|$ by using models. The values obtained with the models of Isgur, Scora, Grinstein and Wise (ISGW) [110], Bauer, Stech and Wirbel (BSW) [101], Körner and Schuler (KS) [100], and Neubert are listed in Table XXI. In principle, the detection efficiencies should be determined separately for each model. This is a small effect and the CLEO II analysis finds the systematic variation from this source to be less than 3%.

In Table XXII, we also give the values of $|V_{cb}|$ determined from exclusive models using the ARGUS measurement of $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\ell^-\nu)$ which gives $\Gamma(\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\ell^-\nu) = 12.3 \pm$

TABLE XXI. Values of $|V_{cb}|$ using the world average for $\Gamma(B \to D^* \ell\nu)$ and theoretical models. The first error is the sum in quadrature of the experimental statistical and systematic errors. The second error is from the B lifetime.

Model	$\lvert V_{cb}\rvert$
ISGW	$0.0349 \pm 0.0015 \pm 0.0006$
ISGW$'$	$0.0347 \pm 0.0015 \pm 0.0006$
BSW	$0.0371 \pm 0.0016 \pm 0.0006$
KS	$0.0342 \pm 0.0015 \pm 0.0006$
Neubert	$0.0323 \pm 0.0014 \pm 0.0006$

5.7 ± 3.5 ns^{-1}. The first error is the sum in quadrature of the statistical and experimental systematic errors. The second error is the uncertainty due to the average B meson lifetime. We note that the other measurements of $B \to D\ell\nu$ branching fractions should not be used as they cannot be modified to account for the changes in the D and D^* branching fractions. Improved measurements of the branching fractions for $B^- \to D^0\ell^-\nu$ and $\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\ell^-\nu$ will be useful in testing models and determining $|V_{cb}|$.

TABLE XXII. Values of $|V_{cb}|$ using the world average for $\Gamma(B \to D^+ \ell\nu)$ and theoretical models. The first error is the sum in quadrature of the experimental statistical and systematic errors. The second error is from the B lifetime.

Model	$\lvert V_{cb}\rvert$
ISGW$'$	$0.032 \pm 0.008 \pm 0.0005$
BSW	$0.038 \pm 0.009 \pm 0.0006$
KS	$0.039 \pm 0.009 \pm 0.0006$

The results in Tables XXI, XXII show that the model dependence in the determination of $|V_{cb}|$ from the total rate is below the 10% level. From the measurement of the branching fraction for $\bar{B} \to D^* \ell\nu$, using the ISGW$'$ model to obtain the central value, gives

$$|V_{cb}| = 0.0347 \pm 0.0016(\text{exp}) \pm 0.0024(\text{model})$$

This method of obtaining $|V_{cb}|$ from the total rate has the distinct advantage that the models used make other detailed predictions for form factors and various other observables which can be experimentally verified (see section IV C). In addition, all of the data can be used unlike the HQET inspired method (discussed below) which is valid only for a certain kinematic regime (near zero recoil).

3. Determination of $|V_{cb}|$ using HQET

It has recently been appreciated that there is a symmetry of QCD that is useful in understanding systems containing one heavy quark. This symmetry arises when the quark becomes sufficiently heavy to make its mass irrelevant to the nonperturbative dynamics of the light quarks. This allows the heavy quark degrees of freedom to be treated in isolation

from the the light quark degrees of freedom. This is analogous to the canonical treatment of hydrogenic atoms, in which the spin and other properties of the nucleus can be neglected. The behaviour and electronic structure of the atom are determined by the light electronic degrees of freedom. Heavy quark effective theory (HQET) was developed by Isgur and Wise [110] who define a single universal form factor, $\xi(v \cdot v^{'})$, known as the Isgur-Wise function. In this function v and $v^{'}$ are the four velocities of the initial and final state heavy quarks. In the heavy quark limit all the form factors for hadronic matrix elements such as $B \to D^*$ and $B \to D$ can be related to this single function. The value of this function can then be determined from a measurement of the $B \to D^* \ell \nu$ rate as a function of q^2 [110]. The theory also provides a framework for systematic calculations of corrections to the heavy quark limit.

In HQET, the decay rate for $B \to D^* \ell \nu$ as a function of y (which is $\gamma_D^* = E_{D^*}/m_{D^*}$ in the B rest frame) can be expressed in terms of a single unknown form factor $\xi(y)$. According to the celebrated result called Luke's theorem [144], at the point of zero recoil for the D^* meson (i.e. $y = 1$), this universal form factor is absolutely normalized up to corrections of order $1/m_Q^2$ (where m_Q is the c quark or b quark mass).

The decay rate

$$d\Gamma/dy = \mathcal{G}(y)\eta_A^2 |V_{cb}|^2 \xi^2(y) \tag{10}$$

where $\mathcal{G}(y)$ is a known function, $\eta_A = 0.986 \pm 0.006$ accounts for QCD corrections and $\xi(y)$ is the universal form factor. After subtracting background and and correcting for efficiency the experimental distribution of $d\Gamma/dy$ is divided by the factor $\mathcal{G}(y)$ to give a distribution whose intercept is $|V_{cb}|^2 \xi^2(1)$. In the limit of heavy quark symmetry, the intercept is the physical quantity of interest, $|V_{cb}|^2$. In principle, the value obtained in this manner has no model dependence.

The $d\Gamma/dy$ distribution is extracted after subtracting backgrounds from fake D^* and random D^* lepton combinations. This distribution is then corrected for efficiency. After dividing through by $\mathcal{G}(y)$ CLEO II obtains the distribution shown in Figure 22 which combines events from the modes $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+} \ell^- \nu$ and $B^- \to D^{*0} \ell^- \nu$. Experimentally, since there are few events near the point of zero recoil, all the available data is used over the entire y range and then an extrapolation to $y = 1$ is made. Most of the functional forms proposed for $\xi(y)$ are roughly linear near $y = 1$. Thus the experimental distribution is fitted to the functional form $|V_{cb}|^2(1 - \hat{\rho}^2(y-1))$. After properly accounting for the smearing in y due to the motion of the B meson [131], the product $\xi(1)\eta_A|V_{cb}|$ is determined (Table XXIII). The dominant experimental systematic error is the uncertainty in the slow pion detection efficiencies.

TABLE XXIII. Experimental measurements of the product $|V_{cb}|\xi(1)\eta_A$ and $\hat{\rho}^2$ in $\bar{B} \to D^* \ell \nu$. These have been corrected for the change in D and D^* branching fractions and the average B meson lifetime.

Experiment	$\xi(1)\eta_A \ \lvert V_{cb}\rvert$	$\hat{\rho}^2$
ARGUS	0.0388 ± 0.0055	1.17 ± 0.23
CLEO II	0.0347 ± 0.0027	0.84 ± 0.15
ALEPH	0.0382 ± 0.0056	0.46 ± 0.34
World Average	0.0359 ± 0.0022	0.88 ± 0.12

TABLE XXIV. Theoretical Calculations of the Intercept of the Isgur-Wise Function.

Theorist	$\xi(1)\eta_A$
Shifman *et al.*	0.89 ± 0.03
Neubert I	0.97 ± 0.04
Neubert II	0.93 ± 0.03
Mannel	0.96 ± 0.03

There are two significant uncertainties in the final determination of $|V_{cb}|$ from measurements of the spectrum at zero recoil. These arise from the model dependence in the calculation of the $1/m_c^2$ corrections to $\xi(1)$ and the lack of knowledge of the functional form of the function $\xi(y)$ which is used for the extrapolation. There are now at least four calculations of $\xi(1)$ to order $1/m_c^2$ from Neubert [146], [147], Mannel [149] and from Shifman, Uraltsev and Vainshtein [150]. For example, using $\xi(1)\eta_A = 0.93 \pm 0.03$ from Neubert [147], we obtain

$$|V_{cb}| = 0.0386 \pm 0.0024(\text{exp}) \pm 0.0012(\text{theory})$$

where the first error is experimental and the second is the quoted uncertainty in $\xi(1)$. Other recent estimates of this product obtained using QCD sum rules are given in Table XXIV and references [146], [147], [149], [150]. The model dependence from the theoretical uncertainty in the normalization is about 4% but may be reduced in the near future.

The uncertainty from the shape of $\xi(y)$ can be investigated using several of the functional forms proposed in the literature. CLEO II finds that the systematic error from this source is less than 5% in $|V_{cb}|$ [132].

Note that the quantity $\hat{\rho^2}$ and the quantity ρ^2 determined in the CLEO II form factor analysis are slightly different. The former is calculated assuming HQS (heavy quark symmetry). An approximate relation between the two values is $\hat{\rho}^2 \approx \rho^2 - 0.2$ [147]. The two values agree well.

The universal form factor $\xi(y)$ is a quantity which cannot be derived in perturbation theory. To obtain this function, one must depend on models or on QCD lattice calculations. For instance, from a fit to the $d\Gamma/dy$ spectrum with a linear functional form, CLEO II obtains

$$\hat{\rho}^2 = 0.84 \pm 0.12 \pm 0.08 \tag{11}$$

A fit using a Taylor expansion which includes a quadratic term for $\xi(y)$ gives slightly different results for $\hat{\rho^2}$. The magnitude of the quadratic term is very poorly determined. The value of $\hat{\rho}^2$ is consistent with most quark models, QCD sum rules, and with lattice calculations.

E. $b \to u$ Transitions and $|V_{ub}|$

A non-zero value of $|V_{ub}|$ is necessary but not sufficient if the Standard Model is to provide a consistent description of the CP violation observed in the kaon sector. A precise measurement of $|V_{ub}|$ is required to constrain the allowed range of CP asymmetries in the B sector. The experimental signature for inclusive $b \to u$ transitions is an excess of leptons beyond the kinematic limit for the transition $b \to c\ell\nu$. The branching ratio for the inclusive

FIG. 22. Distribution of $[\frac{d\Gamma}{dy}\frac{1}{\mathcal{G}(y)}]^{\frac{1}{2}}$ for $\bar{B} \to D^*\ell^-\nu$ candidates with a fit to a linear parameterization of $\xi(y)$, the Isgur-Wise function.

process is large $O(10^{-3})$. However, there are also substantial backgrounds from continuum, misidentified leptons and mismeasured $b \to c$ transitions.

The first evidence for charmless semileptonic B decay and for non-zero $|V_{ub}|$ was reported by the CLEO 1.5 experiment in 1989 from the inclusive lepton momentum spectrum. Corroborating evidence was presented shortly afterwards by the ARGUS experiment, who introduced hermiticity cuts to detect the presence of a neutrino and thus significantly reduce background levels.

To extract a value of $|V_{ub}/V_{cb}|$, the physical quantity of interest, the yield of leptons in the signal window, which is limited to a small portion of the Dalitz plot, must be corrected for detection efficiency and then extrapolated to the full allowed kinematic range range. The resulting width must then be converted to the ratio of CKM matrix elements. In other words,

$$|\frac{V_{ub}}{V_{cb}}|^2 = \frac{\Delta B_{ub}}{B_{cb}\ d(p)} \tag{12}$$

where $\Delta B_{ub} = \dfrac{N_{ub}}{\epsilon}$ and $d(p) = f_u(p)\dfrac{\gamma_u}{\gamma_c}$. In principle, each factor in equation (12) is model dependent. In practice, the only factors with large model dependence are γ_u, which relates the width and $|V_{ub}|$ via $\Gamma(b \to u\ell\nu) = \gamma_u|V_{ub}|^2$ and $d(p)$ the fraction of $b \to u\ell\nu$ decays which lie in the momentum window.

These factors have been determined using a variety of models which belong to two generic classes: inclusive parton models such as the model of Altarelli *et al.* [109] and models with exclusive final states e.g. [110], [100], [101], [102], [163]. Model dependence in the value of

$|V_{ub}|$ is a severe systematic limitation. In the past, as large as a factor of two uncertainty in the value of $|V_{ub}|$ has been assigned to this model dependence.

In principle, the decay rate for an exclusive mode can be translated into a less model dependent value of $|V_{ub}|$ using exclusive models. While no exclusive decay mode accounts for more than 3.5% to 14% of the inclusive rate, backgrounds in individual exclusive modes are fairly small. The most promising modes are $B \to \pi\ell\nu$ and the modes with a vector meson, $B \to \rho^0\ell\nu$, $B \to \rho^+\ell\nu$, and $B \to \omega\ell\nu$. In 1991 ARGUS reported evidence for two fully reconstructed candidates in the $\bar{B}^0 \to \pi^+\ell\nu$ and $B^- \to \omega^0\ell^-\nu$ modes [171].

1. Inclusive Semileptonic $b \to u$ Transitions.

In the analyses of inclusive semileptonic $b \to u$ transitions by CLEO 1.5, ARGUS and CLEO II, tight track quality cuts are imposed and special care is taken to reduce background from mismeasured $b \to c\ell\nu$ decays which can be smeared beyond the kinematic limit. The largest remaining background is then due to continuum processes i.e. non-resonant $q\bar{q}$ production and is suppressed with event shape cuts.

In the CLEO II analysis which has the highest statistical precision, two complementary analyses are carried through. One analysis employs strict cuts which make ample use of the hermiticity of the detector and imposes the requirement that an energetic neutrino be present which is opposite in direction to the lepton. This analysis achieves the best signal to background ratio. There is also a second analysis with no hermiticity cuts and less stringent requirements on event shape variables.

In the analysis with loose cuts, only a modest requirement on the event shape is imposed, $R_2 < 0.3$. This analysis attempts to use selection criteria that are similar to the cuts used in the CLEO 1.5 analysis. The efficiency of the hermiticity cuts used in the strict analysis will depend somewhat on the Q^2 spectrum of $B \to u\ell\nu$. On the other hand, the analysis with strict cuts has the advantage that the allowed phase space is restricted to the region where resonances (π, ρ η, ω) dominate and where exclusive models are most reliable.

The lepton momentum spectrum with the continuum data and a histogram from a $b \to c$ Monte Carlo superimposed is shown in Fig. 23. The background is subtracted using a fit to the continuum data, which were recorded at an energy slightly below the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance. In the loose analysis, $128.5 \pm 26.3 \pm 15.2$ excess leptons are observed in the momentum interval between 2.4 and 2.6 GeV, while in the strict analysis, an excess of $43.0 \pm 10.1 \pm 6.6$ leptons is found in the same interval. As can be seen from Figure 23, the yield beyond the kinematic limit for $b \to u\ell\nu$ production is consistent with zero.

For the loose analysis, the partial branching fraction is $\Delta B_u(2.4, 2.6) = (0.90 \pm 0.18 \pm 0.12) \times 10^{-4}$ while for the strict analysis, the corresponding branching fraction is $\Delta B_u(2.4, 2.6) = (0.70 \pm 0.16 \pm 0.12) \times 10^{-4}$ where the ACCMM model has been used to evaluate the detection efficiency.

The agreement found in CLEO II between the branching fractions from the analysis with strict cuts and the analysis with loose cuts indicates that the choice of q^2 dependent selection criteria in the analysis with tight cuts does not introduce significant model dependence in the final result. The largest source of model dependence is due to the extrapolation from the narrow signal window to the full kinematic range (the factor $f_u(p)$).

FIG. 23. Lepton momentum spectra from CLEO II for (a) the analysis with tight cuts and (b) the analysis with loose cuts. The filled points with error bars represent the $\Upsilon(4S)$ data. The open circles are the data taken below resonance, while the dashed line is the fit to the off-resonance data. The solid histogram is a Monte Carlo simulation of $b \to c\ell\nu$ processes.

The central value for the branching fraction from the CLEO II experiment is significantly below the previous CLEO 1.5 and ARGUS results for this momentum interval. The CLEO II and CLEO 1.5 measurements are consistent at the 2.5 standard deviation level. The large values initially reported by CLEO 1.5 and ARGUS are now believed to be upward fluctuations. In addition, the yields in the lower momentum bins from both the early experiments, which must be determined after subtractions of large $b \to c$ backgrounds, are marginally consistent with the yield in the high momentum ($2.4 - 2.6$ GeV) bin. In the CLEO II analysis, the branching fractions determined from the $2.3 - 2.4$ GeV bin and the $2.4 - 2.6$ GeV bin are in good agreement. For these reasons, we have chosen to determine the value of $|V_{ub}/V_{cb}|$ using the branching fraction measured by CLEO II in the high momentum bin. Note that including the CLEO 1.5 and ARGUS results gives only a small shift in the world average since the errors for these measurements are large.

These results can be used to deduce values for V_{ub}, which are given in Table XXVI. Taking the central value from the ACCMM model gives

$$|\frac{V_{ub}}{V_{cb}}| = 0.073 \pm 0.011(exp) \pm 0.010(model)$$

and a range at the 1 standard deviation level $0.095 > |\frac{V_{ub}}{V_{cb}}| > 0.055$. The table includes the estimate from D. Scora for the revised ISGW model [102] (denoted ISGW2) but does not include the older ISGW model. Incomplete exclusive models such as those of Körner and Schuler and Wirbel-Stech-Bauer that do not calculate all the exclusive final states which are

relevant for the endpoint region are also omitted.

TABLE XXV. Experimental measurements of the partial branching fraction for $b \to u\ell\nu$ transitions in the lepton endpoint region. (*) The ARGUS value is deduced indirectly from the value of $|V_{ub}/V_{cb}|^2$ given in their publication.

Experiment	$\mathcal{B}(2.2-2.6)$ GeV	$\mathcal{B}(2.3-2.6)$ GeV	$\mathcal{B}(2.4-2.6)$ GeV
CLEO 1.5	$(33 \pm 8 \pm 8) \times 10^{-5}$		$(18 \pm 4 \pm 3) \times 10^{-5}$
ARGUS		$(32.8 \pm 7) \times 10^{-5}$ *	
CLEO II		$(8.2 \pm 1.5 \pm 0.9) \times 10^{-5}$	$(7.0 \pm 1.6 \pm 1.2) \times 10^{-5}$
World Average			$(7.0 \pm 2.0) \times 10^{-5}$

TABLE XXVI. Determination of $|V_{ub}/V_{cb}|$ from various theoretical models for the momentum interval $2.4-2.6$ GeV.

Model	$\gamma_u \times 10^{12}$sec	$f(p)$	$d(p)$	$\lvert V_{ub}/V_{cb}\rvert$
ACCMM	80.4	0.055	0.123	0.073 ± 0.011
BBD	68.0	0.074	0.113	0.071 ± 0.011
Hybrid	84.3	0.066	0.135	0.065 ± 0.010
ISGW2	58.8	0.049	0.0703	0.083 ± 0.012

2. Exclusive Semileptonic $b \to u$ Transitions

CLEO II has searched for the exclusive decays $B^+ \to \rho^0\ell^+\nu$ and $\bar{B}^0 \to \rho^+\ell^-\nu$ and $B^+ \to \omega\ell^+\nu$. They require that the observed momenta be consistent with a missing neutrino taking advantage of production at threshold. The ρ (ω) invariant mass spectrum is then examined after applying additional cuts. Event shape cuts are used to suppress background from the dominant background $e^+e^- \to q\bar{q}$ which are jetlike in contrast to $B\bar{B}$ events which are more spherical. The analysis is divided into two lepton momentum ranges: $2.3 > E_{lep} > 2.0$ GeV, and $2.6 > E_{lep} > 2.3$ GeV. All models are in approximate agreement that about 60% (52% in WSB to 72% in ISGW) of the rate is contained in the union of the two ranges.

Both the ARGUS and CLEO II analyses of exclusive $b \to u$ transitions make use of the hermiticity of the detector. For example, CLEO II requires the missing mass of the remainder of the event be greater than -0.2 GeV^2 and less than 5.0 GeV^2. In addition, the missing momentum vector should balance the visible momentum of $Y = \rho\ell$ system.

The branching ratios for $B \to \rho$ and $B \to \omega$ decays are related by the quark model and isospin invariance such that $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to \rho^+\ell\nu) = 2\mathcal{B}(B^- \to \rho^0\ell\nu) = 2\mathcal{B}(B^- \to \omega\ell^-\nu)$. No signal was observed and CLEO placed an upper limit on the production of light vector mesons ($\rho^{+(0)}$, ω)

$$B(B^- \to V^0\ell\nu) < (1.6-2.7) \times 10^{-4} \text{ at the 90\% C.L.}$$

where the upper end of the range corresponds to calculating the efficiency using the ISGW model. The results for different models and for an older ARGUS analysis [171] are listed in Table XXVII.

The CLEO II results are used to obtain the constraints:

$$|V_{ub}/V_{cb}| < 0.08 - 0.13 \text{ at the } 90\% \text{ C.L.}$$

where again the range given corresponds to the three models considered. These limits are consistent with the values of $|V_{ub}/V_{cb}|$ determined from the inclusive lepton spectrum.

ARGUS has also reported the observation of two events in exclusive semileptonic $b \to u$ modes, $\bar{B}^0 \to \pi^+\ell^-\nu$ and $B^- \to \omega\ell^-\nu$ opposite fully reconstructed modes [167].

TABLE XXVII. Measurements of Exclusive Charmless Semileptonic B Branching Ratios. Here V denotes a vector meson as discussed in the text.

Experiment	Mode	ISGW	WSB	KS
ARGUS	$\bar{B} \to \pi^+\ell\nu$	$< 0.9 \times 10^{-3}$		
ARGUS	$\bar{B} \to \rho^0\ell\nu$	$< 1.1 \times 10^{-3}$		
CLEO II	$\bar{B} \to \rho^0\ell\nu$	$< 2.1 \times 10^{-4}$		
CLEO II	$\bar{B} \to \omega\ell\nu$	$< 2.1 \times 10^{-4}$		
CLEO II	$\bar{B} \to \rho^+\ell\nu$	$< 4.1 \times 10^{-4}$		
CLEO II	$\bar{B} \to V\ell\nu$	$< 1.6 \times 10^{-4}$	2.7×10^{-4}	$< 2.3 \times 10^{-4}$

3. Observation of $B \to \pi\ell\nu$ Transitions

The first signal for an exclusive semileptonic charmless decay mode has been reported recently by CLEO II in the mode $B \to \pi\ell\nu$ [178]. Events in which the neutrino momentum is well constrained from the missing energy are used. This allows a beam constrained mass and energy difference to be constructed in analogy to exclusive hadronic B decays. The effective beam constrained mass distribution for $\bar{B}^0 \to \pi^+\ell^-\nu$ and $B^- \to \pi^0\ell^-\nu$ candidates after a cut on the energy difference is shown in Fig. 24. A likelihood fit to the beam constrained mass, the energy difference, and $\sin^2\theta_{\ell\pi}$ distributions [177], shows that the excess has a significance of 3.8 standard deviations. The resulting branching fraction is

$$\mathcal{B}(B \to \pi^+\ell\nu) = 1.19 \pm 0.41 \pm 0.22 \pm 0.19 \times 10^{-4}(ISGW)$$

$$\mathcal{B}(B \to \pi^+\ell\nu) = 1.70 \pm 0.50 \pm 0.31 \pm 0.27 \times 10^{-4}(BSW)$$

for the ISGW and BSW models, respectively [178]. No significant excess is observed in the $\mathcal{B}(B \to \rho\ell\nu)$ mode.

Measurements of branching fractions for exclusive charmless modes will be an important step towards establishing a reliable value of $|V_{ub}|$.

4. Prospects for the Determination of $|V_{ub}|$.

The model dependence in $|V_{ub}/V_{cb}|$, which is larger than the experimental error, will be reduced eventually by the detailed study of inclusive and then exclusive decay modes. At present, with the inclusive sample, rough checks of the Q^2 dependence in inclusive $b \to u$

FIG. 24. Beam constrained mass distributions from CLEO II for (a) $B \to \pi\ell\nu$ and (b) $B \to \rho\ell\nu$ candidates. The dotted line shows the background contribution which includes $b \to c$ and other $b \to u$ decays.

decay are possible. In the future these may allow some discrimination between models (see Figure 25) [169], [170]. For instance, the inclusive Altarelli style model peaks at a lower q^2 than does the ISGW model (the sum of exclusive final states). The early version of the ISGW model disagrees with the observed q^2 spectrum at the 1.5 σ level. With larger data samples this approach will either rule out or severely constrain models of $b \to u$ decay.

If the $b \to c$ backgrounds can be well constrained and the continuum background reduced to a sufficient degree by the use of detector hermiticity, then the stringent lepton momentum cut may be relaxed and a larger fraction of $b \to u\ell\nu$ events accepted. This approach could significantly reduce the model dependence in $|V_{ub}|$.

Once exclusive $b \to u$ modes are observed, various integrated quantities such as the vector meson polarization in $B \to V\ell\nu$ and the average lepton energy can be compared to models. Unlike the $b \to c$ case, the differences between models are significant. It is also possible to compare data on other heavy quark to light quark transitions to models. For example, one can compare the form factors in $D^0 \to K^-\ell\nu$ and $D \to K^*\ell\nu$ to various models [98]. The form factors for $B \to D^*\ell\nu$, where large event samples are available, have also been checked (see section IV C) and are consistent at the present level of experimental precision with HQET and quark models.

As noted by Isgur and Wise, the use of HQS (heavy quark symmetry) gives relations between various heavy to light form factors [173]. For instance, the $B \to \rho$ form factor can

FIG. 25. q^2 distribution for two theoretical models of $b \to u\ell\nu$ transitions. The solid histogram is the model of Altarelli *et al.*while the dashed histogram is the original model of Isgur, Scora, Grinstein and Wise (ISGW).

be related to the corresponding $D \to \rho$ form factor at equal ρ energies provided one assumes that the light degrees of freedom decouple

$$< \rho(k,\epsilon)|\bar{u}\gamma_u(1-\gamma_5)b|\bar{B}(v) >= (\frac{m_B}{m_D})^{1/2}[\frac{\alpha_s(m_b)}{\alpha_s(m_c)}]^{-6/25} \ < \rho(k,\epsilon)|\bar{u}\gamma_u(1-\gamma_5)c|\bar{D}(v) > \quad (13)$$

when the momentum transfer to the ρ meson is much less than a heavy quark mass, i.e. $v \cdot k << m_c, m_b$. If in addition, $SU(3)$ symmetry holds, then the $B \to \rho$ form factor can be related to the $D \to K^*$ form factor. Analogous relations can be derived between the $B \to \pi$ and $D \to K$ form factors [174]. Thus, precise measurements of the form factors in semileptonic D decays in conjunction with measurements of exclusive charmless semileptonic B decays may be useful in the future determination of $|V_{ub}|$ [175]. However, there are several potential difficulties with this approach. The type of relation given in equation (13) may have significant $1/m_Q$ corrections. At very small momentum transfer, other theoretical corrections ("pole terms") may be large. Experimentally, the kinematic range available in $D \to \rho$ decays is much smaller than in the corresponding B decay, so models will still be needed to extrapolate to the case of B decays.

Akhoury, Sterman, and Yao have suggested that measurements of the exclusive decays $\bar{B} \to \pi\ell\nu$ and $\bar{B} \to \rho\ell\nu$ at low Q^2 may be suitable for the determination of $|V_{ub}|$ [176]. They suggest that the inclusive width of these decays in the range $Q^2 = (0 - 9.2)$ GeV^2 can be calculated reliably using QCD factorization theorems. Then experimental measurements of these decays can be used to extract $|V_{ub}|$.

Another possible approach to a model independent determination of $|V_{ub}/V_{cb}|$ has been

FIG. 26. Pseudo q^2 distribution in CLEO II data compared with two theoretical models of $b \to u\ell\nu$ transitions. The original model of ISGW is shown as the solid histogram, while the ACCMM model is the dashed histogram.

suggested by Neubert [361]. The proposed method makes use of the relation between the differential spectra for $b \to u\ell\nu$ and $b \to s\gamma$ transitions to eliminate the uncertainty from the hadronization of $b \to u$ in the endpoint region. A simplified and intuitive description may be useful. The width for inclusive $b \to u$ transitions is proportional to $|V_{ub}|^2 m_b^5$ where m_b is the b quark mass. On the other hand, in the rest frame of the b quark, the average energy of the photon emitted in the inclusive $b \to s\gamma$ decay is $m_b/2$. Thus, determination of the average photon energy in the electromagnetic penguin provides a way to eliminate the uncertainty from the b quark mass. It is remarkable that a slight modification of this idea remains useful after the effect of the cut on lepton energy in $b \to u$, QCD corrections, and the Fermi motion of the b quark have been properly included. Several authors have proposed similar techniques for the determination of $|V_{ub}|$ [360], [362], [363]. It should be noted that if the $b \to u$ endpoint region is dominated by a single resonant mode (e.g. $B \to \rho\ell\nu$), this technique may not be valid [360].

V. $B - \bar{B}$ MIXING

In production processes involving the strong or the electromagnetic interaction neutral B and $\bar{B}$ mesons can be produced. These flavor eigenstates are not eigenstates of the weak interaction which is responsible for the decay of neutral mesons containing b quarks. The

strong eigenstates are linear combinations of the weak eigenstates,

$$|B_1 >= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|B^0 > + |\bar{B}^0 >)$$

$$|B_2 >= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|B^0 > - |\bar{B}^0 >)$$

This feature and the small difference between the masses and/or lifetimes of the weak interaction eigenstates gives rise to the phenomenon of $B - \bar{B}$ mixing. The formalism which describes B meson mixing closely follows that used to describe $K^0 - \bar{K}^0$ mixing, although the time scale characteristic of $B - \bar{B}$ oscillations is much shorter.

If a pure $|B^0 >$ state is produced at time $t = 0$, then at later times it will evolve into a new state which contains an admixture of $|\bar{B}^0 >$. The weak interaction eigenstates are denoted B_1 and B_2, and have masses $M_1,\ M_2$ and widths $\Gamma_1,\ \Gamma_2$ respectively. The difference between the masses is denoted ΔM, while the difference between the widths is $\Delta\Gamma$. The average width will be referred to as Γ. The probability that the state, initially produced as $|B^0 >$ will mix into $|\bar{B}^0 >$ at time t is given by

$$P(B^0 \to \bar{B}^0) = \exp(-\Gamma t)\ [1 - \cos(\Delta M\ t)].$$

For convenience, the ratios $x = \Delta M/\Gamma$ and $y = \Delta\Gamma/2\Gamma$ are frequently introduced. The contribution of y to mixing is usually neglected. Its size is determined by the fraction of final states which are common to both B and $\bar{B}$ mesons. The difference between the width for those final states with one sign of CP and those with the opposite sign determines the magnitude of $\Delta\Gamma$. In contrast to the case of neutral kaons, the branching ratio for such modes (e.g. $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to \psi K^*)$) is small, so $y << x$ for neutral B mesons. The magnitude of x determines the frequency of the mixing oscillations.

The quark level process responsible for $B - \bar{B}$ mixing is shown in Figures 1(g) and 1(h). The contribution to ΔM for $B_d - \bar{B}_d$ mixing is found to be

$$\Delta M_d = \frac{G_F^2}{6\pi^2} m_B m_t^2\ F(\frac{m_t^2}{m_W^2})\ \eta_{QCD} B_{B_d} f_{B_d}^2 |V_{tb}^* V_{td}|^2 \tag{14}$$

where G_F is the weak coupling constant, m_t is the top quark mass, F is a slowly decreasing function which depends on m_t and m_W, η_{QCD} is a factor which accounts for QCD corrections, B_{B_d} is a constant which is used to account for the vacuum insertion approximation, and f_B is the decay constant of the B_d meson. An analogous expression for B_s-$\bar{B}_s$ mixing can also be obtained. Since $|V_{ts}| >> |V_{td}|$, the rate and frequency of mixing for the B_s meson will be significantly larger than for the B_d meson.

Since the mass of the top quark has been determined and the QCD correction has been calculated to NLO ($\eta_{QCD} = 0.55$) [179], the largest uncertainties in Δm_d arise from the product $B_{B_d}^{1/2} f_{B_d}$. This last factor must be determined from non-perturbative methods such as lattice calculations or QCD sum rules.

Evidence for $B_d - \bar{B}_d$ mixing was first reported in 1987 by the ARGUS experiment from the study of like sign lepton correlations [180]. The CLEO 1.5 experiment later confirmed the result [181]. The observed level of mixing was significantly larger than theoretically

FIG. 27. A fully reconstructed event with mixing observed by the ARGUS experiment.

expected and provided the first suggestion that the mass of the top quark was large, much greater than 30 GeV as was indicated by the UA1 experiment at that time.

The substantial mixing rate also implies that CP violation could be large in B decay to CP eigenstates, provided the amplitude for the B decay to a CP eigenstate interfers with the amplitude for a $\bar{B}$ meson to mix and then decay to the same final state. A relative phase between the two amplitudes can be introduced by the CKM couplings. That is, mixing provides a mechanism that gives rise to interfering amplitudes and hence CP violation.

To experimentally measure mixing requires identification of the initial state flavor of the neutral B meson at production as well as the final state flavor after decay of the $\bar{B}$ meson. This "tagging" of the initial flavor can be accomplished using leptons or other partial reconstruction techniques. In addition, the production fraction for the neutral B meson in question must be known.

Several experimental parameters are used to measure the strength of mixing. For example, the ratio of the time integrated number of B^0 and $\bar{B^0}$ mesons is denoted $r = \frac{N(\bar{B}^0)}{N(B^0)}$ if the initial state is $|B^0>$. In general, mixing is measured by studying pairs of B mesons since one of the B hadrons is needed to tag the flavor at production. The ratio of the number of mixed events to the number of unmixed events is given by

$$R = \frac{N(BB + \bar{B}\bar{B})}{N(B\bar{B} + \bar{B}B)}$$

At threshold, this becomes

$$R = \frac{N(B^0B^0 + \bar{B}^0\bar{B}^0)}{N(B^0\bar{B}^0 + \bar{B}^0B^0)}$$

On the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance and at the threshold for $B\bar{B}^*$ production, $B\bar{B}$ pairs are produced coherently i.e. in a state of definite orbital angular momentum. Quantum statistics for spin zero particles implies that the wave function of the $B\bar{B}$ must be antisymmetric (symmetric) for production with odd (even) orbital angular momentum. This is the case for production at the $\Upsilon(4S)$ where

$$R = \frac{x^2}{2 + x^2} \text{ (l odd)}$$

At $B\bar{B}^*$ threshold, the relative orbital angular momentum is zero, and

$$R = \frac{3x^2 + x^4}{2 + x^2 + x^4} \text{ (l even)}$$

Production of neutral B mesons at the Z^0 and at hadron colliders is an incoherent sum of these two cases.

It is also useful to define χ which is the probability that a produced neutral B meson mixes and then decays as a neutral $\bar{B}$ meson. The fraction of mixed events is then $2\chi\,(1-\chi)$. Experiments at the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance extract the mixing parameter from the observed ratio of like-sign dileptons to opposite dileptons. This requires knowledge of the relative production of B^+B^- and $B^0\bar{B}^0$ mesons pairs. For this case, $\chi_d = (1+\Lambda)r_{wrong}$, where $\Lambda = f_+/f_0(\tau^+/\tau^0)^2$, r_{wrong} is the ratio of the number of like-sign dileptons to opposite sign dileptons and f_+, f_0 are the fractions of $B^0\bar{B}^0$ and B^+B^- pairs produced, respectively. The current uncertainty in Λ leads to a systematic uncertainty of about 20% in measurements of mixing from threshold experiments which use like sign dileptons to determine the b quark flavor.

A. $B_d - \bar{B}_d$ Mixing

The determination of the B_d mixing parameter with the best statistical precision is obtained from measurements of the rate for like-sign dileptons in experiments at threshold. The yield of like-sign dileptons is found after subtracting background contribution from non-resonant production (continuum), cascades, $\psi^{(\prime)}$s and misidentified leptons. There are results from the ARGUS, CLEO1.5 and CLEOII experiments (see Table XXVIII).

To reduce the systematic error from the poorly measured fraction Λ, another technique to increase the $B^0 - \bar{B}^0$ content of the sample has been developed. Events which contain a wrong sign lepton and a partially reconstructed $B \to D^{*+}\ell\nu$ decay are used. In this case, it is not necessary to detect the decay products of the D^0 meson. The method takes advantage of the small energy release in the decay $D^{*+} \to D^0\pi^+$ and the kinematic constraints of production near threshold [183], [113].

In the CLEO II analysis, the energy of the D^* is approximated by $(E_\pi/E^*_\pi) \times M_{D^*}$ where E_π is the energy of the slow π in the laboratory frame and E^*_π is the corresponding energy in the center of mass frame [183], [184]. The direction of the slow pion is a good estimator of the D^* direction. A quantity analogous to missing mass is formed:

$$MM^2 \approx (E_{beam} - E_l - E^*_D)^2 - |p_l + p^*_D|^2$$

TABLE XXVIII. Measurements of the mixing parameter χ_d from threshold experiments. The first error is statistical, while the second is the experimental systematic error and the third is due to the uncertainty in Λ.

Experiment	Technique	χ_d
ARGUS	ℓ^+,ℓ^+	$0.173 \pm 0.038 \pm 0.044^{+0.031}_{-0.023}$
CLEO 1.5	ℓ^+,ℓ^+	$0.142 \pm 0.035 \pm 0.034^{+0.025}_{-0.019}$
CLEO II	ℓ^+,ℓ^+	$0.157 \pm 0.016 \pm 0.018^{+0.028}_{-0.021}$
ARGUS	partial $D^{*-}\ell^+\nu,\ell^+$	$0.162 \pm 0.043 \pm 0.039$
CLEO II	partial $D^{*-}\ell^+\nu,\ell^+$	$0.149 \pm 0.023 \pm 0.019 \pm 0.010$
Average $\Upsilon(4S)$	ℓ^+,ℓ^+	$0.156 \pm 0.020^{+0.027}_{-0.020}(\Lambda)$
Average $\Upsilon(4S)$	partial $D^{*-}\ell^+\nu,\ell^+$	$0.151 \pm 0.0265 \pm 0.010(\Lambda)$

where E_{D^*} and p_{D^*} are the estimates of the D^* energy and momentum determined from the slow pion energy and direction. For signal events, the variable MM^2 peaks near zero with a width of 0.9 GeV^2. A similar partial reconstruction technique has been applied by ARGUS [113].

The measurement of χ_d using the partial reconstruction technique substantially reduces the systematic uncertainty from Λ but has a slightly larger statistical error. Note that the results from the dilepton and partial reconstruction analyses should not be combined since there is substantial overlap between the datasets used for the two analyses.

TABLE XXIX. Measurements of the mixing parameter ΔM_d in units of ps^{-1}. The notation (time) indicates that an explicitly time dependent measurement was performed to determine the mixing parameter.

Experiment	Technique	Δm_d
ALEPH	ℓ^+,ℓ^+(time)	$0.44 \pm 0.05^{+0.09}_{-0.06}$
OPAL	ℓ^+,ℓ^+(time)	$0.462^{+0.040+0.052}_{-0.053-0.035}$
DELPHI	ℓ^+,ℓ^+(time)	$0.53^{+0.11+0.11}_{-0.10-0.10}$
ALEPH	$D^*\ell^+, Q_j$(time)	$0.497 \pm 0.070 \pm 0.036$
OPAL	$D^*\ell^+, Q_j$(time)	$0.508 \pm 0.075 \pm 0.025$
DELPHI	$D^*\ell^+, Q_j$ (time)	$0.456 \pm 0.068 \pm 0.043$
OPAL	D^{*+},ℓ^+(time)	$0.57 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.02$
DELPHI	ℓ^+, K^+, Q_j(time)	$0.586 \pm 0.049 \pm 0.062$
DELPHI	D^{*+}, Q_j(time)	$0.50 \pm 0.12 \pm 0.06$
$\Upsilon(4S)$	partial $D^{*-}\ell^+,\ell^+$	0.405 ± 0.041
LEP	(time)	0.501 ± 0.034
World Average		0.462 ± 0.026

Time integrated mixing measurements from LEP and hadron colliders determine the quantity $\chi = f_d\chi_d + f_s\chi_s$ where f_d and f_s are the fractions of B_d and B_s mesons produced. This method gives weak constraints on χ_s and χ_d which are not competitive with those

deduced from the time dependent measurements and from the experiments at the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance. Hence these results will not be discussed further. Additional details and a summary of these results are available in Ref. [86].

The ALEPH, DELPHI and OPAL experiments have performed explicit measurements of $P(B^0 \to \bar{B}^0)$ as a function of time to obtain the parameter x_d [186], [187], [188]. The initial state b quark flavor is tagged either using leptons or jet charge, while the flavor of the final state b quark is tagged using either $\bar{B}_d \to D^{*+}\ell^- X$, $\bar{B}_d \to D^{*+} X$, or $\bar{B}_d \to \ell^- X$. If the final state is not fully reconstructed, as is the case for the analyses using dileptons, then the decay time must be determined using a topological vertexing technique where the lepton from the B decay and the other tracks in the same jet hemisphere are combined. The boost is determined using the observed energy, missing momentum and a correction factor determined from a Monte Carlo simulation.

The observed fraction of like sign leptons $N_{++}/(N_{++}+N_{+-})$ is clearly not time independent (see Figure 28) and the beginning of one oscillation cycle is visible. A full oscillation lasts about 15 ps. Due to the effects of acceptance and resolution, additional oscillations are not seen. The largest contributions to the systematic errors in the measurements of Δm_d using time dependent D^*-lepton correlations arise from the uncertainties in the decay time resolution and the knowledge of the charged B meson fraction. For the measurements with dileptons and those using the lepton-jet charge tagging technique, the uncertainty in the B_s fraction at the Z^0 also gives a significant contribution to the systematic error.

The results from the LEP experiments with silicon vertex detectors are given in Table XXIX as well as the average of the CLEO II and ARGUS measurements using the partial reconstruction technique. The $\Upsilon(4S)$ value was computed using the world average for the B^0 lifetime. The results from the various time dependent techniques used by the LEP experiments were averaged separately and then combined to form the LEP average. For the LEP dilepton measurements, a common systematic error of 0.09 ps^{-1} was assumed, while for the $D^{*+}l^-$, Q_J results, a common systematic error of 0.02 ps^{-1} was assumed. The systematic errors in the different techniques were then assumed to be uncorrelated. This treatment of the systematic errors gives slightly more weight to the results with jet charge tagging technique than a simple weighted average.

B. $B_s - \bar{B}_s$ Mixing

The measurement of the mixing parameter $x_s = \Delta M/\Gamma$ for the B_s meson is one of the goals of high energy collider experiments and experiments planned for future facilities [8,6,9]. A measurement of x_s combined with a determination of x_d, the corresponding quantity for the B_d meson, allows the determination of the ratio of the CKM matrix elements $|V_{td}|^2/|V_{ts}|^2$ with significantly reduced theoretical uncertainties. The ratio of the mixing parameters can be written as

$$\frac{x_s}{x_d} = \frac{(m_{B_s}\eta_{QCD}Bf_{B_d}^2)}{(m_{B_d}\eta_{QCD}Bf_{B_s}^2)}\left|\frac{V_{ts}^2}{V_{td}^2}\right|\frac{\tau_d}{\tau_s} \tag{15}$$

FIG. 28. The fraction of wrong sign leptons as a function of time from the ALEPH experiment.

where the factor which multiplies the ratio of CKM matrix elements is believed to be unity up to $SU(3)$ breaking effects. Ali and London [357] have estimated

$$\frac{\Delta m_s}{\Delta m_d} \;=\; (1.19 \pm 0.10)\,\frac{|V_{ts}|^2}{|V_{td}|^2}$$

The time integrated probability that a neutral B meson mixes is $\chi = \frac{1}{2}\frac{x^2}{1+x^2}$. As x becomes large, as is expected for the B_s meson, χ asymptotically approaches 0.5. Thus time integrated measurements of B_s mixing are insensitive to x_s when mixing is maximal, and one must make time dependent measurements in order to extract this parameter. These are experimental challenging due to the rapid oscillation rate of the B_s meson.

Using dilepton events in which the tagging lepton is vertexed with other tracks in the same hemisphere and the neutrino energy is deduced from the energy flow in the event, ALEPH has searched for a high frequency component in their fit to the proper time distribution. They find $\Delta M_s > 3.9$ ps $^{-1}$ or $x_s > 5.5$ [186]. From an event sample with a lepton and a tag using a special jet charge where each track is weighted by its rapidity [189], ALEPH has obtained an even tighter constraint on the rate of B_s mixing. The jet charge tagging technique allows a high efficiency, of order 45%, to be achieved with mistagging probability of about 21%. The upper limit on B_s mixing is determined by performing a series of Monte Carlo experiments. Allowing for systematic error including a 30% uncertainty in the B_s fraction, they obtain $\Delta M_s > 6$ ps $^{-1}$ or $x_s > 8.5$ at the 95% confidence level [186], [185].

Similarly, OPAL uses the dilepton technique and allows for a high frequency component in their fit. They obtain $\Delta M_s > 2.2$ ps^{-1} which gives $x_s > 3.0$ at the 95% confidence level [188].

Other tagging techniques, for example, using the fragmentation kaon to enhance the B_s content or partial reconstruction of the D_s meson are being investigated by the high energy collider experiments.

For the B_s meson, the quantity $\Delta\Gamma$ may be large enough to be observable. Parton model calculations [190] and calculations with exclusive final states [191] suggest that the width difference may be $10-20\%$. This lifetime difference could be determined experimentally by using decays to final states with different CP. For example, a measurement of a difference in the lifetimes between $\bar{B}_s^0 \to \psi\phi$ and $\bar{B}_s^0 \to D_s^- \ell^+ \nu$ would yield $\Delta\Gamma/\Gamma^2$. It has also been suggested that such measurements could be used to constrain $|V_{ts}/V_{td}|^2$ if parton model calculations are reliable [192].

VI. INCLUSIVE B DECAY

A. Motivation

Due to the large mass of the b quark B meson decays give rise to a large number of secondary decay products. For instance, CLEO finds that the charged and photon multiplicities at the $\Upsilon(4S)$ are: $n_{\rm charged} = 10.99 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.29$, $n_\gamma = 10.00 \pm 0.53 \pm 0.50$, respectively [193]. Similarly, ARGUS [194] finds $n_{\rm charged} = 10.74 \pm 0.02$. The high multiplicity of final state particles leads to a large number of possible exclusive final states. Even with a detector that has a large acceptance for both charged tracks and showers, it is difficult to reconstruct many exclusive final states because of the combinatorial backgrounds. Furthermore the detection efficiency drops for high multiplicity final states. Thus, to get a complete picture of B meson decay, it is important to study inclusive decay rates.

A number of theoretical calculations of inclusive B decay rates have been made using the parton model. It is believed that measurements of such inclusive rates can be more reliably compared to the theoretical calculations than can measurements of exclusive decays While this is sufficient motivation for studying the inclusive rates, there is also a need for accurate measurements in order to model the decays of B mesons both for high energy collider experiments, and for experiments at the $\Upsilon(4S)$. As a specific example, the inclusive rate for $B \to \psi$ has been used to determine the B meson production cross-section at the Tevatron [195].

The branching ratios for inclusive B decays to particular final state particles are determined by measuring the inclusive yields of these particles in data taken on the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance, and subtracting the non-resonant background using data taken at energies below the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance. The off-resonance data are scaled to correct for the energy dependence of the continuum cross-section. Results on inclusive production at the $\Upsilon(4S)$ are usually presented as a function of the variable x, which is the fraction of the maximum possible momentum carried by the particle, $p_{max} = \sqrt{E_{beam}^2 - M^2}$. The endpoint for production in B decays is at $x = 0.5$.

B. Inclusive B Decay to Mesons

CLEO 1.5 [196] has measured the branching fractions of inclusive B decays to light mesons, while ARGUS has determined the average multiplicities of light mesons in B decay.

FIG. 29. The momentum spectra for $B \to \eta X$ as measured in CLEO II data.

If more than one meson of the particle type under study is produced in a $B\bar{B}$ decay, then the branching fraction and the multiplicity will differ. Unless otherwise noted, the results reported in Table XXX are averaged over B and $\bar{B}$ decay.

In the decay $b \to c \to s$ the charge of the kaon can be used to determine the flavor of the b quark. A first attempt to measure the tagging efficiency and misidentification probability for this method has been performed by ARGUS [197]. With the large sample of reconstructed B^0 and B^+ decays from CLEO II it should be possible to measure these quantities directly. The experiments also measure the momentum spectra for the particles listed in Table XXX. An example of such data is the momentum spectrum for $B \to \eta$ production shown in Figure 29. These results provide important information needed to improve Monte Carlo generators and determine tagging efficiencies for future B experiments [198].

The inclusive production of D^0, D^+, D_s^+ and D^{*+} mesons in B decay has been measured by ARGUS [199] and CLEO 1.5 [200]. Preliminary measurements of several of these inclusive branching fractions from CLEO II have also become available [39], [202]. To improve signal to background, only the $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$, $D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+$ and $D_s^+ \to \phi\pi^+$ decay modes are used. The results, rescaled for the charm branching ratios, are given in Table XXXII.

Other detailed properties of inclusive B decay have been determined in addition to branching fractions. The momentum spectrum for the inclusive decay of B mesons to D^0, D^+, and D^{*+} as measured by CLEO 1.5 are shown in Fig. 30. The D^{*+} spectrum is not measured for $x < 0.1$ due to poor reconstruction efficiency for slow tracks. The polarization as a function of x for $B \to D^{*+}$ has also been measured and was found to be consistent with the predictions of Wirbel and Wu [201] and of Pietschmann and Rupertsberger [203].

Analyses of the shape of the D_s momentum spectrum (Fig. 31) indicates that there is a substantial two body component. In model dependent fits the ARGUS and CLEO 1.5

FIG. 30. $B \to D^0 X$, $D^+ X$, and $D^{*+} X$ momentum spectra in CLEO 1.5 data. The dashed curve is the prediction of the phenomenological model of Wirbel and Wu while the solid histogram is the prediction of their free quark model

experiments find two body fractions of $(58 \pm 7 \pm 9)\%$ [199] and $(56 \pm 10)\%$ [200], respectively. CLEO II finds a somewhat smaller two body fraction, $45.7 \pm 1.9 \pm 3.7 \pm 0.6$ where the last error accounts for the uncertainty due to model dependence in the predictions for the rates for the two body modes [39]. There is no uncertainty in this results from the $D_s \to \phi\pi$ branching fraction. Averaging the results from the three experiments we find a two body component of $(49.4 \pm 4.4)\%$ which leads to $\mathcal{B}(B \to D_s X \text{ (two body)}) = (4.8 \pm 1.3)\%$. It is important to determine which mechanisms are responsible for the production of the remainder, the lower momentum D_s mesons. Two possibilities are external W^- emission with $W^- \to \bar{c}s$ or $W^- \to \bar{u}d$ with $s\bar{s}$ quark popping.

Results on inclusive B decay to final states with ψ and ψ' mesons have been reported by CLEO 1.5 [28], ARGUS [32], and CLEO II [205]. Indirect measurements of charmonium production have been reported by CDF [207] and the LEP experiments [208]. Because of the large uncertainties in the composition of their data samples, these results have not been included in our determination of the world averages listed in Table XXXII. In the most recent high statistics analysis from CLEO II, the effect of final state radiation has been taken into account [209]. This effect leads to a significant tail on the low side of the $\psi \to e^+e^-$ mass peak and a smaller effect in the $\mu^+\mu^-$ spectrum. Even with a large mass window that extends from 2.50 to 3.05 GeV/c^2, this effect can modify the calculated detection efficiency by more than 10%. Small corrections are also made for non-resonant ψ production in the CLEO II analysis [210]. The resulting invariant dielectron and dimuon mass distributions are shown in Fig. 32. The theoretical predictions for charmonia production in B decay [215,216,218] will be discussed further in Section XI E.

TABLE XXX. Multiplicities or branching fractions of light mesons per B meson decay.

Mode	CLEO 1.5 [196] (Branching Ratio)	ARGUS [197] (Multiplicity)
$B/\bar{B} \to \pi^{\pm}$ (not from K_s, Λ)		$3.59 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.07$
$B/\bar{B} \to \pi^{\pm}$ (incl. K_s, Λ)		$4.11 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.08$
$B/\bar{B} \to K^{\pm}$	$0.85 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.09$	$0.78 \pm 0.02 \pm 0.03$
$\bar{B} \to K^{-}$	$0.66 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.07$	
$\bar{B} \to K^{+}$	$0.19 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.02$	
$B/\bar{B} \to K^0/\bar{K}^0$	$0.63 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.06$	$0.64 \pm 0.01 \pm 0.04$
$B/\bar{B} \to K^{*0}$		$0.146 \pm 0.016 \pm 0.020$
$B/\bar{B} \to K^{*+}$		$0.182 \pm 0.054 \pm 0.024$
$B/\bar{B} \to \rho^0$		$0.209 \pm 0.042 \pm 0.033$
$B/\bar{B} \to \omega$		< 0.41 (90% C.L.)
$B/\bar{B} \to f_0(975)$		< 0.025 (90% C.L.)
$B/\bar{B} \to \eta$	$0.176 \pm 0.011 \pm 0.0124$ (CLEO II)	
$B/\bar{B} \to \eta'$		< 0.15 (90% C.L.)
$B/\bar{B} \to \phi$	$0.023 \pm 0.006 \pm 0.005$	$0.039 \pm 0.003 \pm 0.004$

The momentum spectrum for $B \to \psi, \psi'$ transitions has been measured (Fig. 33). The two body component due to $B \to \psi K$ and $B \to \psi K^*$ saturates the spectrum in the momentum range between 1.4 and 2.0 GeV. By subtracting the contributions from ψ's originating in ψ' and χ_c decays CLEO and ARGUS measure the momentum distribution of the direct component shown in Fig. 33(b). The average branching ratio for direct ψ production is found to be $\mathcal{B}(B \to \psi$, where ψ not from $\psi') = (0.82 \pm 0.08)\%$. The two body component constitutes about 1/3 of direct ψ production.

TABLE XXXI. ψ polarization Γ_L/Γ in inclusive B meson decays.

ψ momentum	CLEO II [211]	ARGUS [212]
$p_\psi < 0.8$ GeV/c	0.55 ± 0.35	
0.8 GeV/c $< p_\psi <$ 1.4 GeV/c	0.49 ± 0.32	
1.4 GeV/c $< p_\psi <$ 2.0 GeV/c	0.78 ± 0.17	1.17 ± 0.17
all $p_\psi < 2.0$ GeV/c	0.59 ± 0.15	

The polarization Γ_L/Γ as a function of momentum for $B \to \psi$ transitions has also been determined (see Table XXXI). According to ARGUS, the ψ mesons in the highest momentum bin are completely longitudinally polarized. Since the highest momentum bin is dominated by two body B decay, the polarization measured in this bin can be used to estimate the polarization of $B \to \psi K^*$ after correcting for the contribution of $B \to \psi K$. Therefore the ARGUS result indicates that the $B \to \psi K^*$ mode is dominated by a single orbital angular momentum state and hence by a single CP eigenstate. Integrating over the range of kinematically allowed momenta, CLEO measures the average polarization of ψ mesons in B

FIG. 31. $B \to D_s X$ momentum spectrum in CLEO II data. The solid histogram is the sum of the two components. The two dotted histograms indicate the two body components from $\bar{B} \to D^{(*)} D_s^{(*)-}$ and $\bar{B} \to D^{(**)} D_s^{(*)-}$. The dash-dotted histogram shows the contribution of the three body process.

decay to be $\Gamma_L/\Gamma = 0.59 \pm 0.15$. This result is consistent with the longitudinal polarization of 54% predicted by Palmer and Stech [218]. Using factorization and HQET, M. Wise finds significantly more transverse polarization, $\Gamma_L/\Gamma \approx 0.25$ in the inclusive process [217].

Results on inclusive $B \to \chi_c X, \chi_c \to \gamma\psi$ decays have been reported by ARGUS [214] and CLEO II [205,210]. ARGUS assumes there is no χ_{c2} production. CLEO II has significantly better χ_c mass resolution than ARGUS and allows for both possibilities. The branching ratio for $\chi_{c0} \to \gamma\psi$ is $(6.6 \pm 1.8) \times 10^{-3}$ so the contribution of the χ_{c0} meson to the $\psi\gamma$ final state can be neglected. CLEO finds evidence at the 2.5 standard deviation level for a $B \to \chi_{c2}$ contribution which would indicate non-factorizable contributions or higher order processes $O(\alpha_s^2)$ in $b \to c\bar{c}s$ [215].

The decay of B mesons to the lightest charmonium state, the η_c, has not yet been observed. A recent CLEO II search placed a upper limit of 0.9% on the process $B \to \eta_c X$ at the 90% confidence level [205].

Using the results in Table XXXII, it is possible to isolate the component of $B \to \psi$ production which is due to production of higher charmonium states in B decay and the direct component. Similiarly, the direct $B \to \chi_{c1}$ component can be determined by removing the contribution from $B \to \psi^{'}$, $\psi^{'} \to \chi_{c1}\gamma$. It is assumed, that all ψ' mesons are directly produced.

Using the procedures outlined in Section II the results reported by the different experiments have been rescaled to accommodate the new charm branching ratios. The world averages for inclusive $B \to$ meson decays are given in Table XXXII.

FIG. 32. $B \to$ Charmonium X invariant mass spectra from CLEO II: (a) $\psi \to e^+e^-$ channel and (b) $\psi \to \mu^+\mu^-$ channel. (c) $\psi\gamma - \psi$ mass difference showing the χ_{c1} and χ_{c2} signals.

C. Inclusive B Decay to Baryons

ARGUS [219] and CLEO 1.5 [220] have observed inclusive production of $\bar{p}$, Λ, Ξ and the charmed Λ_c baryon. Recently CLEO II has reported the observation of $B \to \Sigma_c X$ [225], $B \to \Xi_c^0 X$ and $B \to \Xi_c^+ X$ [224]. The measured branching ratios for these decays and the world averages can be found in Table XXXII.

The determination of branching ratios for inclusive B decays to the charmed baryons Λ_c and Σ_c requires knowledge of $\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \to pK^-\pi^+)$. However, the uncertainty in this quantity is still large as it can only be determined by indirect and somewhat model dependent methods. The results given in this review use $\mathcal{B}(\Lambda_c^+ \to pK^-\pi^+) = (4.3 \pm 1.0 \pm 0.8)\%$ [220]. For modes involving Λ_c baryons the uncertainty due to the Λ_c branching ratio scale is listed as a separate error.

The momentum spectrum of $B \to \Lambda_c$ transitions has been measured by CLEO 1.5 [220] and ARGUS [219]. The result of a recent CLEO II [225] measurement is shown in Fig. 36(a). The momentum spectrum is rather soft indicating Ξ_c production or the presence of a significant multibody component. Similarly, CLEO II has found that $B \to \Sigma_c^0 X$ and $B \to \Sigma_c^{++} X$ decays have no two body contribution.

In addition to the inclusive branching ratios given above, the experimental data has been used in attempts to disentangle which of the baryon production mechanisms shown in Fig. 34 dominates. CLEO 1.5 [220] and ARGUS [219] have investigated baryon correlations in B decay in order to elucidate the underlying decay process. We follow the notation of Reference [220] . Let N denote baryons with $S = C = 0$ (e.g. p, n, Δ, N^*). Let Y refer to baryons with $S = -1, C = 0$ (e.g. Λ, Σ^0, Σ^+). Let Y_c refer to baryons with $S = 0, C = 1$ [e.g. Λ_c^+, $\Sigma_c^{(+,0,++)}$] . Then the following final states can be used to distinguish possible mechanisms

FIG. 33. $B \to$ Charmonium X momentum spectra in CLEO II data. (a) Inclusive $B \to \psi X$ production with contributions from individual decay channels overlaid. (b) Direct $B \to \psi X$ production. (c) $B \to \psi' X$.

for baryon production in B decay (Fig. 34).

1. $\bar{B} \to Y_c \bar{N} X$, $\bar{B} \to \Xi_c \bar{Y} X$
   These final states are produced by the usual $b \to cW^-$ coupling in a spectator or exchange diagram in conjunction with the popping of two quark pairs from the vacuum (as shown in Figs. 34(a),(b)). It should be noted that the two mechanisms can be distinguished by examination of the Y_c momentum spectrum, since the exchange diagram will produce two body final states (e.g. $\Lambda_c \bar{p}$ or $\Sigma_c^{++} \bar{\Delta}^{--}$).

2. $\bar{B} \to DN\bar{N}X$, $\bar{B} \to DY\bar{Y}X$
   The non-charmed baryon-antibaryon pair is produced from W fragmentation after hadronization with two quark-antiquark pairs popped from the vacuum (as shown in Figs. 34(c),(d)). The D meson is formed from the charm spectator quark system. If this mechanism is significant, inclusive production of charmless baryon-antibaryon pairs should be observed in B decay.

3. $\bar{B} \to Y_c \bar{Y} X$, $\bar{B} \to \Xi_c \bar{Y}_c X$
   These states are produced by the internal spectator graph with $W^- \to \bar{c}s$ in conjunction with the popping of two quark antiquark pairs. Since $\mathcal{B}(W^- \to \bar{c}s)/\mathcal{B}(W^- \to all)$ is about 0.15, this mechanism may be suppressed.

4. $\bar{B} \to D_s^- Y_c \bar{N} X$, $\bar{B} \to D_s^- \Xi_c \bar{Y} X$
   This is the same as mechanism (1) with $W^- \to \bar{c}s$.

The low rates for $B \to \Lambda\bar{\Lambda}X$, $\Lambda\bar{p}X$ and $D^* p\bar{p}X$(see Table XXXIII) suggest that mechanism (2) is small. The absence of a two body component in the momentum spectra of

TABLE XXXII. Branching fractions [%] of inclusive B decays

Particle	ARGUS	CLEO 1.5	CLEO II	Average
$\bar{B} \to D^0 X$	$49.7 \pm 3.8 \pm 6.4 \pm 2.6$	$59.7 \pm 3.2 \pm 3.6 \pm 3.1$	$63.8 \pm 1.1 \pm 2.0 \pm 1.7$	$62.1 \pm 2.0 \pm 3.2$
$\bar{B} \to D^- X$	$23.0 \pm 3.0 \pm 4.4 \pm 1.5$	$24.9 \pm 3.3 \pm 2.0 \pm 1.6$		$24.2 \pm 3.1 \pm 1.6$
$\bar{B} \to D^{*-} X$	$26.7 \pm 2.3 \pm 4.5 \pm 1.4$	$22.7 \pm 1.3 \pm 2.3 \pm 1.2$		$23.5 \pm 2.3 \pm 1.2$
$\bar{B} \to D_s^- X$	$7.9 \pm 1.1 \pm 0.8 \pm 1.9$	$8.3 \pm 1.2 \pm 2.0$	$11.5 \pm 0.4 \pm 0.8 \pm 2.9$	$9.8 \pm 0.6 \pm 2.4$
$\bar{B} \to \phi X$		$2.3 \pm 0.6 \pm 0.5$		2.3 ± 0.8
$\bar{B} \to \psi X$	$1.25 \pm 0.19 \pm 0.26$	$1.31 \pm 0.12 \pm 0.27$	$1.13 \pm 0.04 \pm 0.06$	1.15 ± 0.07
$\bar{B} \to \psi X$ (direct)	0.95 ± 0.27		0.81 ± 0.08	0.82 ± 0.08
$\bar{B} \to \psi' X$	$0.50 \pm 0.19 \pm 0.12$	$0.36 \pm 0.09 \pm 0.13$	$0.34 \pm 0.04 \pm 0.03$	0.35 ± 0.05
$\bar{B} \to \chi_{c1} X$	$1.23 \pm 0.41 \pm 0.29$		$0.40 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.04$	0.42 ± 0.07
$\bar{B} \to \chi_{c1} X$ (direct)			0.37 ± 0.07	0.37 ± 0.07
$\bar{B} \to \chi_{c2} X$			$0.25 \pm 0.10 \pm 0.03$	0.25 ± 0.10
$\bar{B} \to \eta_c X$			< 0.90 (90% C.L.)	< 0.90 (90% C.L.)
$\bar{B} \to p X$	$8.2 \pm 0.5 \pm 1.2$	$8.0 \pm 0.5 \pm 0.3$		8.0 ± 0.5
$\bar{B} \to \bar{\Lambda} X$	$4.2 \pm 0.5 \pm 0.6$	$3.8 \pm 0.4 \pm 0.6$		4.0 ± 0.5
$\bar{B} \to \Xi^+ X$	< 0.51 (90% C.L.)	$0.27 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.04$		0.27 ± 0.06
$\bar{B} \to \Lambda_c^- X$	$7.0 \pm 2.8 \pm 1.4 \pm 2.1$	$6.3 \pm 1.2 \pm 0.9 \pm 1.9$	$4.2 \pm 0.5 \pm 0.6 \pm 1.3$	$4.7 \pm 0.7 \pm 1.4$
$\bar{B} \to \Sigma_c^0 X$			$0.53 \pm 0.19 \pm 0.16 \pm 0.16$	$0.53 \pm 0.25 \pm 0.16$
$\bar{B} \to \Sigma_c^0 \bar{N}$			< 0.17 (90% C.L.)	< 0.17 (90% C.L.)
$\bar{B} \to \Sigma_c^{++} X$			$0.50 \pm 0.18 \pm 0.15 \pm 0.15$	$0.50 \pm 0.23 \pm 0.15$
$\bar{B} \to \Sigma_c^{++} \bar{\Delta}^{--}$			< 0.12 (90% C.L.)	< 0.12 (90% C.L.)
$\bar{B} \to \Xi_c^+ X$			1.5 ± 0.7	1.5 ± 0.7
$\bar{B} \to \Xi_c^0 X$			2.4 ± 1.3	2.4 ± 1.3

TABLE XXXIII. Branching fractions [%] of inclusive B decays to baryon pairs.

Mode	CLEO 1.5	ARGUS
$B \to p\bar{p}\ X$	$2.4 \pm 0.1 \pm 0.4$	$2.5 \pm 0.2 \pm 0.2$
$B \to \Lambda\bar{\Lambda}\ X$	< 0.5 (90% C.L.)	< 0.88 (90% C.L.)
$B \to \Lambda\bar{p}\ X$	$2.9 \pm 0.5 \pm 0.5$	$2.3 \pm 0.4 \pm 0.3$
$B \to D^{*+} p\bar{p}\ X$	< 0.35 (90% C.L.)	
$B \to DN\bar{N}\ X$	< 5.2 (90% C.L.)	

$B \to \Lambda_c X$, $\Sigma_c X$ indicates that the W-exchange mechanism is small. Thus it was thought reasonable to assume that $\bar{B} \to Y_c \bar{N} X$ with an external spectator $b \to cW^-$ coupling (Fig. 34(a)) is the principal mechanism in B to baryon transitions.

If B decays to baryons are dominated by $\bar{B} \to \Lambda_c \bar{p} X$ and $\bar{B} \to \Lambda_c \bar{n} X$ then measurements of the branching ratios for $B \to \bar{p} X$, $B \to p\bar{p} X$ can be used to extract the absolute $\Lambda_c \to pK^-\pi^+$ branching ratio. The CLEO 1.5 measurements give $B(\Lambda_c \to pK^-\pi^+) = 4.3 \pm 1.0 \pm 0.8\%$ which can be used to normalize all other measured Λ_c branching ratios. In a similar fashion, ARGUS finds $(4.1 \pm 2.4)\%$ for this branching ratio.

An alternate explanation for the absence of a two body component in B decays to baryons was recently proposed by Dunietz, Falk and Wise [221]. These authors suggested that the primary mechanism in such decays is the internal W-emission process $b \to c\bar{c}s$. This might lead to two body final states such as $\bar{B} \to \bar{\Lambda}_c \Xi_c$ which would account for the softness of the Λ_c momentum spectrum. CLEO has searched for the mechanism suggested by Dunietz *et al.* in a variety of ways. By examining Λ_c-lepton correlations, it is possible to constrain the size of the $b \to c\bar{c}s$ component in $B \to$ baryon decays. The $b \to c\bar{c}s$ component gives rise to opposite sign $\Lambda_c^+ \ell^-$ correlations whereas the internal process W-emission process $b \to cu\bar{d}$ gives same sign $\Lambda_c^+ \ell^+$ correlations (Fig. 37(a)). From the ratio of same sign to opposite sign

FIG. 34. Decay diagrams for B meson decays to baryons: (a) External spectator diagram (b) W Exchange diagram (c) External spectator diagram which produces $DN\bar{N}X$ and $DY\bar{Y}X$ final states (d) Internal spectator diagram which produces $DN\bar{N}X$ and $DY\bar{Y}X$ final states.

Λ_c-lepton yields, CLEO finds $b \to c\bar{c}s/b \to c\bar{u}d = (20 \pm 13 \pm 4)\%$ for internal W-emission processes. This shows that $b \to c\bar{c}s$, although present, is not the dominant mechanism operating in B decays to baryons.

CLEO II has measured the Λ_c^+ momentum spectrum separately for $\Lambda_c^+\ell^-$ and $\Lambda_c^+\ell^+$ correlations (Figs. 37(b), (c)). The Λ_c^+ momentum spectrum is somewhat softer in events containing an additional ℓ^- tag. This is consistent with the expectation that $b \to c\bar{c}s$ transitions produce Λ_c^+ baryons accompanied by very massive $\bar{\Xi}_c$ baryon. On the other hand, in $b \to c\bar{u}d$ transitions, the Λ_c^+ is produced in association with a lighter nucleon or nucleon resonance, which should result in a hard Λ_c^+ momentum spectrum.

Since the $b \to c\bar{c}s$ mechanism is present, Ξ_c^+ and Ξ_c^0 baryons should be produced in $B \to$baryon transitions. However, Ξ_c^0 baryons can also be produced from $b \to c\bar{u}d$ transitions with $s\bar{s}$ popping. Naively, one estimates $s\bar{s}$ popping to be approximately 15% of all $q\bar{q}$

FIG. 35. Baryon production in B meson decay via internal W emission. (a) $b \to c\bar{u}d$ with $q\bar{q}$ popping, (b) $b \to c\bar{c}s$ with $q\bar{q}$ popping.

FIG. 36. Momentum spectrum of Λ_c baryons from B decay (CLEO II). (a) The overlaid histograms show the spectra from two components of the internal W-emission process $b \to c\bar{c}s$, $\bar{B} \to \Xi_c\bar{\Lambda}_c$, and $\bar{B} \to \Xi_c'\bar{\Lambda}_c$. (b)The overlaid histograms are the results of a Monte Carlo study assuming multibody $\Lambda_c + (n\pi)$ final states with different numbers of additional pions. (c) The Λ_c momentum spectrum for events with a Λ_c^+ in coincidence with a high momentum lepton (ℓ^-) tag. (d) The Λ_c momentum spectrum for events with a Λ_c^+ in coincidence with a high momentum lepton (ℓ^+) tag.

popping. Thus this mechanism should contribute $\dfrac{B \to \Xi_c\bar{\Lambda}X}{B \to \Lambda_c NX} \approx 0.15$ to the observed $B \to \Xi_c$ rate. A simple phase space argument gives $\dfrac{W^- \to \bar{c}s}{W^- \to \bar{u}d} \approx 0.30$. Combining these two contributions, one expects a $B \to \Xi_c$ branching ratio of $0.45 \times \mathcal{B}(B \to \Lambda_c X)$. Experimentally, the sum of the rates for $B \to \Xi_c^+$ and $B \to \Xi_c^0$ decays relative to $B \to \Lambda_c X$ is consistent with this expectation

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}(B \to \Xi_c X)}{\mathcal{B}(B \to \Lambda_c X)} \;=\; 0.8 \pm 0.4$$

However, the Ξ_c absolute branching ratio scale is poorly known and the experimental errors need to be reduced before any final conclusion can be deduced from this ratio.

To verify whether the dominant mechanism for baryon production in B decays is the external spectator mechanism with $b \to c\bar{u}d$ as was previously assumed by the CLEO and ARGUS analyses, CLEO II has searched for evidence of $B \to \Lambda_c\bar{N}\ell\nu$. This should give rise to several distinctive experimental signatures: Λ-lepton correlations, Λ_c-lepton correlations, and semi-exclusive $B \to \Lambda_c^+\bar{p}\ell^-\nu$ production having a massing mass consistent with a B decay. No significant signals were observed and limits (at the 90% C.L.) of $(B \to \Lambda_c\bar{N}X\ell\nu)/(B \to \Lambda_c X) < 5.7\%$, $(B \to \Lambda_c\bar{N}\ell\nu)/(B \to \Lambda_c X) < 6\%$, $(B \to \Lambda_c\bar{p}\ell\nu)/(B \to \Lambda_c X) < 10\%$, respectively, were obtained [222]. These limits indicate that the conventional and previously accepted picture of baryon production in B decay is incorrect.

A possible explanation of all the existing data requires the simultaneous presence of

FIG. 37. Λ_c- lepton correlation in B decay (CLEO II). (a) The $pK^-\pi^+$ invariant mass spectrum for $\Lambda_c^+ - \ell^+$ combinations. (b) The $pK^-\pi^+$ invariant mass spectrum for $\Lambda_c^+ - \ell^-$ combinations.

several production mechanisms. The internal spectator process $b \to c\bar{u}d$ followed by $u\bar{u}$ or $d\bar{d}$ quark popping is dominant. This leads to production of a high mass excited anti-nucleon in conjunction with a charmed baryon and accounts for the soft momentum spectrum of charmed baryons produced in B decay as well as the absence of $B \to \Lambda_c \bar{N} X \ell\nu$. The internal spectator process $b \to c\bar{c}s$ with quark popping as well as the internal spectator process $b \to c\bar{u}d$ with $s\bar{s}$ quark popping are also operative at the 10-20% level. The latter two mechanisms account for the production of Ξ_c baryons in B decay.

D. Charm Production in B Decay

The measurements of inclusive decay rates can be used to test the parton level expectation that most B decays proceed via a $b \to c$ transition. If we neglect the small contributions from $b \to u$ and penguin transitions, we expect about 1.15 charm quarks to be produced per B decay. The additional 15% is due to the fact that the virtual W forms a $s\bar{c}$ quark pair with a probability of approximately 0.15. To verify this expectation we use the experimental results listed in Table XXXII and determine the charm yield to

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Charm yield} = {} & \mathcal{B}(B \to D^0 X) + \mathcal{B}(B \to D^+ X) + \mathcal{B}(B \to D_s X) \\ & + \mathcal{B}(B \to \Lambda_c X) + \mathcal{B}(B \to \Xi_c^+ X) + \mathcal{B}(B \to \Xi_c^0 X)\end{aligned}$$

FIG. 38. Evidence for Ξ_c production in B decays (CLEO II). (a) Continuum subtracted $\Xi_c^0 \to \Xi^-\pi^+$ invariant mass distribution. (b) Continuum subtracted $\Xi_c^+ \to \Xi^-\pi^+\pi^+$ invariant mass distribution.

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+ 2 \times \mathcal{B}(B \to \psi X) + 2 \times \mathcal{B}(B \to \psi' X) + 2 \times \mathcal{B}(B \to \chi_{c1} X) \\
&+ 2 \times \mathcal{B}(B \to \chi_{c2} X) + 2 \times \mathcal{B}(B \to \eta_c X \text{ (incl. other } c\bar{c})) \\
&= 1.10 \pm 0.06
\end{aligned}
$$

The factor of 2 which multiplies $\mathcal{B}(B \to c\bar{c}X)$ accounts for the two charm quarks produced in $b \to c\bar{c}s$ transitions. Wherever possible the branching fractions for direct production are used. The contribution of $B \to \eta_c X$ and other charmonia is generously taken to be at the CLEO 90% confidence level upper limit for the process $B \to \eta_c X$.

Another interesting quantity is the fraction of B decays in which two charm quarks are produced. In a parton level calculation, Palmer and Stech [218] find that $\mathcal{B}(B \to X_{c\bar{c}}) = 19 \pm 1\%$ where the theoretical error is the uncertainty due to the choice of quark masses. This can be compared to the sum of the experimental measurements

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{B}(B \to X_{c\bar{c}}) &= \mathcal{B}(B \to D_s X) + \mathcal{B}(B \to \psi X) + \mathcal{B}(B \to \psi' X) \\
&+ \mathcal{B}(B \to \chi_{c1} X) + \mathcal{B}(B \to \chi_{c2} X) + \mathcal{B}(B \to \Xi_c X) \\
&+ \mathcal{B}(B \to \eta_c X \text{ (incl. other } \bar{c})) \\
&= (15.6 \pm 2.7)\%
\end{aligned}
$$

where the direct $B \to \psi$ and $B \to \chi_{c1}$ branching fraction have been used. The contribution from $B \to \Xi_c^0 X$ is reduced by 1/3 to take into account the fraction that is not produced by the $b \to c\bar{c}s$ subprocess but by $b \to c\bar{u}d + s\bar{s}$ quark popping.

With the addition of these recent experimental results the understanding of baryon production in B decay is improving. In contrast to meson production in B decay, $B \to$ baryon

transitions proceed predominantly through the internal W-emission process $b \to c\bar{u}d$ followed by light quark pair popping. In a parton level calculation with diquark correlation taken into account, Palmer and Stech [218] have performed a calculation of the total rate for inclusive B decay to charmed baryons. They find $\mathcal{B}(B \to \text{charmed baryons}) \approx 6\%$. In order to compare this prediction with experimental data, we will assume most B to charmed baryon decays proceed through a Λ_c baryon but correct for the small fraction of Ξ_c baryons produced by $b \to c\bar{u}d$ transitions combined with $s\bar{s}$-popping. This gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{B}(B \to \text{charmed baryons}) &= \mathcal{B}(B \to \Lambda_c X) + 1/3 \times \mathcal{B}(B \to \Xi_c^0) \\ &= (5.5 \pm 1.6)\%\end{aligned}$$

TABLE XXXIV. CLEO II results on exclusive branching ratios for $B \to$baryon transitions [223].

B mode	Events observed	$\mathcal{B}$ [%]
$\bar{B}^0 \to \Lambda_c^+ \bar{p}$	< 2.3	$< 4.4 \times 10^-2$
$\bar{B}^0 \to \Lambda_c^+ \bar{p}\pi^0$	< 2.3	< 0.076
$\bar{B}^0 \to \Lambda_c^+ \bar{p}\pi^+\pi^-$	15.0 ± 4.7	$0.187 \pm 0.059 \pm 0.056 \pm 0.045$
$\bar{B}^0 \to \Lambda_c^+ \bar{p}\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$	< 11.6	< 0.76
$\bar{B}^0 \to \Lambda_c^+ \bar{p}\pi^+\pi^-\pi^+\pi^-$	< 6.4	< 0.34
$B^- \to \Lambda_c^+ \bar{p}\pi^-$	< 6.4	< 0.084
$B^- \to \Lambda_c^+ \bar{p}\pi^-\pi^0$	< 8.7	< 0.36
$B^- \to \Lambda_c^+ \bar{p}\pi^-\pi^+\pi^-$	< 14.7	< 0.55
$B^- \to \Lambda_c^+ \bar{p}\pi^-\pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$	< 15.6	< 2.17

The experimental result for the charm yield per B decay is consistent with the naive expectation that 1.15 charm quarks are produced per b decay. However, it does not support a number of proposals which suggest that at least 1.3 quarks should be produced per b decay. In these recent theoretical efforts, large charm quark yields are a consequence of modifying the heavy quark masses in order to explain the discrepancy between theoretical calculations and experimental measurements of the inclusive semileptonic rate, $\mathcal{B}(B \to X\ell\nu)$ (see Section XII C) [226].

The data are not yet sufficiently precise to convincingly rule out the possibility of a larger charm yield. In addition, there are several possible systematic flaws in the computation of the yield of charm quarks. The charm meson absolute branching fractions can contribute a systematic uncertainty, although the errors from this source have been significantly reduced by the recent precise determinations of $\mathcal{B}(D^0 \to K^-\pi^+)$ [50] and $\mathcal{B}(D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+)$. However, the absolute branching fraction scales for the D_s meson and Λ_c baryons are still quite uncertain. Since the inclusive branching ratios to these particles are small, a substantial change to the branching ratio scale would be required to significantly modify the charm yield.

There could also be a large contribution to the inclusive rate that has not been measured. It has been suggested by Palmer and Stech [218], that $b \to c\bar{c}s$ followed by $c\bar{c} \to$ gluons, which in turn hadronize into a final state with no charm, has a large branching ratio. The charm content for this mechanism would not be properly taken into account. Another related suggestion is that the rate for the hadronic penguin diagram $b \to sg$ is larger than expected [124].

VII. EXCLUSIVE B DECAY TO BARYONS

The first exclusive B →baryon decay has been observed by CLEO II [223]. A small signal was reconstructed in the mode $\bar{B}^0 \to \Lambda_c \bar{p}\pi^+\pi^-$ corresponding to a branching ratio of $0.187 \pm 0.059 \pm 0.056 \pm 0.045\%$. In addition, CLEO II has set limits on other exclusive modes which are given in Table XXXIV.

VIII. EXCLUSIVE B DECAY TO D MESONS

A. Measurements of $D(n\pi)^-$ Final States

The decay modes $\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\pi^-$, $\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\rho^-$, $B^- \to D^0\pi^-$, and $B^- \to D^0\rho^-$ are reconstructed following the procedures outlined in Section II A 2. The beam constrained mass distributions from CLEO II are shown in Fig. 4, while the experimental branching ratios are given in Tables XXXIX and XL .

To select $\bar{B} \to D\rho^-$ candidates additional requirements are imposed on the $\pi^-\pi^0$ invariant mass and the ρ helicity angle. The CLEO II analysis requires $|m(\pi^-\pi^0) - 770| < 150$ MeV and $|\cos\Theta_\rho| > 0.4$. For the $B \to D\rho^-$ modes there are events which are consistent with both $B \to D\rho^-$ and with $B \to D^*\pi^-$, followed by $D^* \to D\pi^0$. These events are removed from the $B \to D\rho^-$ sample using a cut on the $D^* - D$ mass difference. By fitting the $\pi^-\pi^0$ mass spectrum and the helicity angle distribution, CLEO II finds that at least 97.5% of the $B \to D\pi^-\pi^0$ rate is described by the decay $B \to D\rho^-$ [228]. ARGUS [30] also finds that the $\pi^-\pi^0$ mass spectrum is consistent with the dominance of ρ production.

B. Measurements of $D^*(n\pi)^-$ Final States

We now consider final states containing a D^* meson and one, two or three pions. These include the $B \to D^*\pi^-$, $B \to D^*\rho^-$, and $B \to D^*a_1^-$ decay channels. The results for the decays $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^-$, $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\rho^-$ and $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^-\pi^-\pi^+$ are listed in Table XL, and the results for $B^- \to D^{*0}\pi^-$, $B^- \to D^{*0}\rho^-$ and $B^- \to D^{*0}\pi^-\pi^-\pi^+$ are given in Table XXXIX.

The CLEO II B^- and $\bar{B}^0$ signals in the $D^*\pi$ and $D^*\rho$ decay channels are shown in Fig. 39. They find that $B \to D^*\pi^-\pi^0$ is saturated by the decay $B \to D^*\rho^-$ (Fig. 40) and set a tight upper limit of $< 9\%$ at 90% C.L. on a possible non-resonant contribution [229]. This disagrees with an ARGUS analysis that finds about 50% of $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^-\pi^0$ decays do not contain a ρ^- meson [32].

The CLEO II data suggest that the signal in $B \to D^*\pi^-\pi^-\pi^+$ arises dominantly from $B \to D^*a_1^-$. Taking into account the $a_1 \to \pi^-\pi^-\pi^+$ branching fractions it follows that $\mathcal{B}(B \to D^*a_1^-) = 2 \times \mathcal{B}(B \to D^*\pi^-\pi^-\pi^+)$. In Fig. 41 we show the M_B distributions when the $\pi^-\pi^-\pi^+$ invariant mass is required to be in the interval $1.0 < \pi^-\pi^-\pi^+ < 1.6$ GeV. Fig. 42 shows a fit to the $\pi^-\pi^-\pi^+$ mass distributions with contributions from $B \to D^{*+}a_1^-$ and a $B \to D^{*+}\pi^-\rho^0$ non-resonant background. The a_1 meson has been parameterized as a Breit-Wigner resonance shape with $m_{a_1} = 1182$ MeV and $\Gamma_{a1} = 466$ MeV. This fit gives an upper limit of 13% on the non-resonant component in this decay. This conclusion differs

FIG. 39. Beam constrained mass distributions from CLEO II for: (a) $B^- \to D^{*0}\pi^-$ decays, (b) $B^- \to D^{*0}\rho^-$ decays, (c) $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^-$ decays, and (d) $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\rho^-$ decays.

FIG. 40. Resonant substructure for $B \to D^*\rho^-$ from CLEO II for: (a) the $\pi^0\pi^-$ invariant mass spectrum for the $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^0\pi^-$ decay mode in data. (b) the $\pi^0\pi^-$ invariant mass spectrum for the $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^0\pi^-$ decay mode in data.

FIG. 41. Beam constrained mass distributions from CLEO II for: (a) $B^- \to D^{*0} a_1^-$ and (b) $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+} a_1^-$.

FIG. 42. Resonant substructure of $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+} a_1$ from CLEO II: (a) The $\pi^-\pi^-\pi^+$ invariant mass spectrum from a Monte Carlo simulation of $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+} a_1^-$ (b) The $\pi^-\pi^-\pi^+$ invariant mass spectrum from Monte Carlo simulation for $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}(\pi^-\rho^0)_{NR}$ (c) The $\pi^-\pi^-\pi^+$ mass spectrum from data after B mass sideband subtraction. The fit to the sum of (a) and (b) is superimposed.

FIG. 43. Beam constrained mass distributions from CLEO II for: (a) $B^- \to D^{**0}(2420)\pi^-$ where $D^{**0}(2420) \to D^{*+}\pi^-$, (b) $B^- \to D^{**0}(2460)\pi^-$ where $D^{**0}(2460) \to D^{*+}\pi^-$, (c) $B^- \to D^{**0}(2420)\pi^-\pi^0$ where $D^{**0}(2420) \to D^{*+}\pi^-$, (d) $B^- \to D^{**0}(2460)\pi^-\pi^0$ where $D^{**0}(2460) \to D^{*+}\pi^-$

from CLEO 1.5 which attributed $(35 \pm 15 \pm 8)\%$ of their $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^-\pi^-\pi^+$ signal to non-resonant $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^-\rho^0$ decays [27]. ARGUS also finds a significant non-a_1 component in this decay but does not quote a quantitative result [32].

The Cabibbo suppressed decay modes such as $B \to DK$ should also be observed and studied in the future. These modes, in particular, $B^+ \to D^0K^+$ and $B^+ \to \bar{D}^0K^+$ with $D^0 \to |f_{CP}>$ (where $|f_{CP}>$ denotes a CP eigenstate) will be used at B factories to constrain one of the three angles of the unitary triangle.

C. Polarization in $B \to D^{*+}\rho^-$ Decays

The sample of fully reconstructed $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\rho^-$ decays from CLEO II has been used to measure the D^{*+} and ρ^- polarizations. By comparing the measured polarizations in $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\rho^-$ with the expectation from the corresponding semileptonic B decay a test of the factorization hypothesis can be performed (see Sec. XI B). The polarization is obtained from the distributions of the helicity angles Θ_ρ and Θ_{D^*}. The D^{*+} helicity angle, Θ_{D^*}, is the angle between the D^0 direction in the D^{*+} rest frame and the D^{*+} direction in the rest

FIG. 44. Angular distributions (efficiency corrected) from CLEO II for (a) the helicity angle from $D^{*+} \to D^0\pi^+$ in $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\rho^-$ and (b)the helicity angle from $\rho^- \to \pi^-\pi^0$ in $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\rho^-$ (c) the helicity angle from $D^{*+} \to D^0\pi^+$ in $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^-$

frame of the B meson. After integration over χ, the angle between the normals to the D^{*+} and the ρ^- decay planes, the helicity angle distribution can be expressed as

$$\frac{d^2\Gamma}{d\cos\Theta_{D^*} d\cos\Theta_\rho} \propto \frac{1}{4}\sin^2\Theta_{D^*}\sin^2\Theta_\rho(|H_{+1}|^2 + |H_{-1}|^2) + \cos^2\Theta_{D^*}\cos^2\Theta_\rho|H_0|^2 \qquad (16)$$

where H_i are the amplitudes for the various possible D^* helicity states. The fraction of longitudinal polarization is defined by

$$\frac{\Gamma_L}{\Gamma} \;=\; \frac{|H_0|^2}{|H_{+1}|^2 + |H_{-1}|^2 + |H_0|^2} \qquad (17)$$

If Γ_L is large both the D^{*+} and the ρ^- helicity angles will follow a $\cos^2\Theta$ distribution, whereas a large transverse polarization, Γ_T, gives a $\sin^2\Theta$ distribution for both helicity angles.

To measure the polarization the helicity angle distributions in the B signal region are corrected by subtracting the distributions from a properly scaled mass sideband. The resulting helicity angle distributions, corrected for efficiency, are fitted to the functional form:

$$\frac{d\Gamma}{d\cos\Theta} = N\;\left[\cos^2\Theta \;+\; \frac{1}{2}\frac{\Gamma_T}{\Gamma}(1 - 3\cos^2\Theta)\right]. \qquad (18)$$

FIG. 45. Beam constrained mass distributions for $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{(*)+} D_s^{(*)-}$ from CLEO II.

This form is derived from the angular distribution given above. It is well behaved for large longitudinal polarization. From the fit to the D^{*+} helicity angle distribution, they find $\Gamma_L/\Gamma = (85 \pm 8)\%$, while a fit to the ρ helicity angle distribution gives $\Gamma_L/\Gamma = (97 \pm 8)\%$. The results of the fit are shown in Fig. 44(a) and (b). As a consistency check they have verified that the D^{*+} mesons in $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^-$ are completely longitudinally polarized, as expected from angular momentum conservation (Fig. 44(c)).

The statistical errors can be reduced by taking advantage of the correlation between the two helicity angles. An unbinned two dimensional likelihood fit to the joint $(\cos\Theta_{D^*}, \cos\Theta_\rho)$ distribution gives

$$(\Gamma_L/\Gamma)_{\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\rho^-} \;=\; 93 \pm 5 \pm 5\% \tag{19}$$

D. Measurements of D^{**} Final States

In addition to the production of D and D^* mesons, the charm quark and spectator antiquark can hadronize as a D^{**} meson. The $D^{**0}(2460)$ has been observed experimentally and identified as the $J^P = 2^+$ state, while the $D^{**0}(2420)$ has been identified as the 1^+ state. These states have full widths of approximately 20 MeV. Two other states, a 0^+ and another 1^+ are predicted but have not yet been observed, presumably because of their large intrinsic widths. There is evidence for D^{**} production in semileptonic B decays [231], and D^{**} mesons have also been seen in hadronic decays. However, early experiments did not have sufficient

FIG. 46. Beam constrained mass distributions for $B^- \to D^{(*)0} D_s^{(*)-}$ from CLEO II.

data to separate the two narrow D^{**} states and hence reported branching ratios only for the combination of the two (see results listed under $B \to D_J^{(*)0}$ in Tables XXXIX – XLII).

In order to search for D^{**} mesons from B decays the final states $B^- \to D^{*+}\pi^-\pi^-$ and $B^- \to D^{*+}\pi^-\pi^-\pi^0$ are studied. These decay modes are not expected to occur via a spectator diagram in which the c quark and the spectator antiquark form a D^* rather than a D^{**} meson. The D^{*+} is combined with a π^- to form a D^{**} candidate. If the D^{**} candidate is within one full width of the nominal mass of either a $D^{**0}(2420)$ or a $D^{**0}(2460)$, it is combined with a π^- or ρ^- to form a B^- candidate. CLEO II has also looked for D^{**} production in the channels $B^- \to D^+\pi^-\pi^-$ and $\bar{B}^0 \to D^0\pi^-\pi^+$. Since $D^{**0}(2420) \to D\pi$ is forbidden, only the $D^{**0}(2460)$ is searched for in the $D\pi\pi$ final state.

Fig. 43 shows candidate B mass distributions obtained by CLEO II for the four combinations of $D^{**0}(2460)$ or $D^{**0}(2420)$, and π^- or ρ^-. In the $D^{**0}(2420)\pi^-$ mode, there is a significant signal of 8.5 events on a background of 1.5 events. In this channel CLEO II quotes the branching ratio given in Table XXXIX, while for the other three channels, they give upper limits. ARGUS has also found evidence for $B \to D^{**}(2420)\pi^-$ using a partial reconstruction technique in which they observe a fast and slow pion from the D^{**} decay but do not reconstruct the D^0 meson [230].

Other final states with higher pion multiplicities should be systematically studied in the future. For example, due to the large combinatorial background, there is little information available on $B \to D^{(*)}\pi\pi\pi\pi$.

TABLE XXXV. D_s decay channels used to reconstruct $B \to DD_s$ decays.

ARGUS [33]	CLEO 1.5 [232]	CLEO II
$D_s^+ \to \phi\pi^+$	$D_s^+ \to \phi\pi^+$	$D_s^+ \to \phi\pi^+$
$D_s^+ \to \phi\pi^+\pi^0$		$D_s^+ \to \phi\pi^+\pi^0$
$D_s^+ \to \phi\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-$		
$D_s^+ \to K_s K^+$	$D_s^+ \to K_s K^+$	$D_s^+ \to K_s K^+$
$D_s^+ \to K_s K^{*+}$		
$D_s^+ \to \bar{K}^{*0} K^+$	$D_s^+ \to \bar{K}^{*0} K^+$	$D_s^+ \to \bar{K}^{*0} K^+$
$D_s^+ \to K^{*0} \bar{K}^{*+}$	$D_s^+ \to \bar{K}^{*0} K^{*+}$	
		$D_s^+ \to \eta\pi^+$
		$D_s^+ \to \eta\rho^+$
$D_s^+ \to \eta'\pi^+$		

E. Exclusive Decays to D and D_s Mesons

Another important class of modes are decays to two charmed mesons. As shown in Fig. 1 (a) the production of an isolated pair of charmed mesons ($D_s^{(*)}$ and $D^{(*)}$) proceeds through a Cabibbo favored spectator diagram in which the $s\overline{c}$ pair from the virtual W^- hadronizes into a D_s^- or a D_s^{*-} meson and the remaining spectator quark and the c quark form a $D^{(*)}$ meson. These modes have been observed by the CLEO 1.5 [232], ARGUS [33] and CLEO II [39] experiments. The decay channels listed in Table XXXV are used to form D_s meson candidates. B mesons are then reconstructed in eight decay modes: $D_s^- D^+$, $D_s^- D^0$, $D_s^{*-} D^+$, $D_s^{*-} D^0$, $D_s^- D^{*+}$, $D_s^- D^{*0}$, $D_s^{*-} D^{*+}$, and $D_s^{*-} D^{*0}$ (See figs. 45,46). The sum of the exclusive modes, averaged over B^- and $\bar{B}^0$ decays, is $4.93 \pm 0.72\%$. This can be compared to the branching fraction of the two body component found in the fit to the inclusive D_s momentum spectrum of 4.5 ± 1.2. The error is dominated by the uncertainty in $\mathcal{B}(D_s \to \phi\pi)$. The remaining contribution to the inclusive production of D_s mesons must be due to the decay modes $B \to D_s^{**} D^{(*)}$, $B \to D_s^{(*)} D^{(*)}(n\pi)$ or $D_s^{(*)} D\pi$.

Partial reconstruction techniques are also being investigated to improve the size of the signals in $B \to D^{(*)} D_s^{(*)+}$. Larger samples not only reduce the statistical error in the branching ratio measurements but will also allow the polarization in $B \to D^* D_s^{*+}$ decays to be determined. Comparsion of the yield in partially reconstructed and fully reconstructed $B \to D^* D_s^{(*)+}$ events will also give a model independent measurement of $\mathcal{B}(D_s \to \phi\pi^+)$ which sets the scale for the D_s branching fractions. Branching fractions and background levels for CP eigenstates such as $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{(*)+} D^{(*)-}$ will also be studied.

IX. COLOR SUPPRESSED B DECAY

A. Exclusive B Decays to Charmonium

In B decays to charmonium the c quark from the b combines with a $\bar{c}$ quark from the virtual W^- to form a charmonium state. This process is described by the color suppressed

FIG. 47. Beam-constrained mass from CLEO II for: (a) $B^- \to \psi K^-$, (b) $\bar{B^0} \to \psi \bar{K^0}$, (c) $B^- \to \psi \bar{K}^{*-}$, (d) $\bar{B^0} \to \psi K^{*0}$, (e) $B^- \to \psi' K^-$, (f) $\bar{B^0} \to \psi' \bar{K^0}$, (g) $B^- \to \psi' \bar{K}^{*-}$, and (h) $\bar{B^0} \to \psi' K^{*0}$.

diagram shown in Fig. 1(b). By comparing B meson decays to different final states with charmonium mesons the dynamics of this decay mechanism can be investigated.

The decay modes $\bar{B^0} \to \psi K^0$ and $\bar{B^0} \to \psi' K^0$ are of special interest since the final states are CP eigenstates. These decays are of great importance for the investigation of one of the three CP violating angles accessible to study in B decays. It is also possible to use the decay $\bar{B^0} \to \psi K^{*0}$, $K^{*0} \to K^0 \pi^0$ which has a somewhat higher branching ratio, but this final state consists of a mixture of CP eigenstates. It has even CP if the orbital angular momentum L is 0 or 2 and odd CP for L=1. If both CP states are present the CP asymmetry will be diluted. A measurement of CP violation in this channel is only possible if one of the CP states dominates, or if a detailed moments analysis of the various decay components is performed [234]. Recent measurements of the polarization in the decay $\bar{B^0} \to \psi \bar{K}^{*0}$ allow us to determine the fractions of the two CP states.

B meson candidates are formed by combining a charmonium and a strange meson candidate. CLEO 1.5 and ARGUS have observed signals for some of these modes. Using the procedures outlined in Sec. II A 2 the beam constrained mass distributions shown in Fig. 47 are obtained by CLEO II. CLEO II has also reported a signal in the Cabibbo suppressed decay $B^- \to \psi \pi^-$, The branching ratios are listed in Tables XXXIX and XL . Recently, CDF has reported signals for $B \to \psi K^{*0}$ and $B \to \psi K^-$ (see Fig. 5) and measurements of polarization in $B \to \psi K^*$ decays [213]. Averaging over B^- and $\bar{B^0}$ decays we determine the sum of the exclusive two-body decays to $\mathcal{B}(B \to \psi\, K(K^*,\, \pi)) \;=\; 0.258 \pm 0.030\%$ and $\mathcal{B}(B \to \psi' K(K^*, \pi)) \;=\; 0.22 \pm 0.09\%$. The first results represents about 1/4 of the inclusive rate for direct $B \to \psi$ production. The experimental investigation of the remaining fraction is important, since any additional quasi-two body channel open to $B \to \psi$ transitions could

FIG. 48. Distributions of the efficiency corrected ψ and K^* helicity angles in $B \to \psi K^*$ decays from CLEO II. The overlaid smooth curves are projections of the unbinned maximum likelihood fit described in the text.

be useful for future studies of CP violation, Lower momentum ψ mesons could originate from multibody final states or from two body decays involving heavier $K^{(*)}$ resonances.

Evidence for the decay mode $B \to \chi_{c1} K$ has been reported by CLEO II [210,34] and ARGUS [32]. The average branching fraction is $\mathcal{B}(B^- \to \chi_c K^-) = (0.104 \pm 0.040)\%$. The CLEO II collaboration has also placed upper limits on $\chi_{c1} K^0$ and $\chi_{c1} K^*$ production in B decay.

B. Polarization in $B \to \psi K^*$

The polarization in $B \to \psi K^*$ is studied using the methods described for the $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\rho^-$ polarization measurement in Section VIII C. After integration over the azimuthal angle between the ψ and the K^* decay planes, the angular distribution in $B \to \psi K^*$ decays can be written as

$$\frac{d^2\Gamma}{d\cos\Theta_\psi d\cos\Theta_{K^*}} \propto \frac{1}{4}\sin^2\Theta_{K^*}(1+\cos^2\Theta_\psi)(|H_{+1}|^2+|H_{-1}|^2) + \cos^2\Theta_{K^*}\sin^2\Theta_\psi |H_0|^2, \tag{20}$$

where the K^* helicity angle Θ_{K^*} is the angle between the kaon direction in the K^* rest frame and the K^* direction in the B rest frame and Θ_ψ is the corresponding ψ helicity angle, and $H_{\pm 1,0}$ are the helicity amplitudes. The fraction of longitudinal polarization in $B \to \psi K^*$

TABLE XXXVI. Upper limits (90% C.L) on color suppressed B decays.

Decay Mode	Events	U. L. (%)
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^0\pi^0$	< 20.7	< 0.048
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^0\rho^0$	< 19.0	< 0.055
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^0\eta$	< 9.5	< 0.068
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^0\eta'$	< 3.5	< 0.086
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^0\omega$	< 12.7	< 0.063
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*0}\pi^0$	< 11.0	< 0.097
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*0}\rho^0$	< 8.1	< 0.117
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*0}\eta$	< 2.3	< 0.069
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*0}\eta'$	< 2.3	< 0.27
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*0}\omega$	< 9.0	< 0.21

TABLE XXXVII. Upper limits on ratios of branching fractions for color suppressed to normalization modes.

Ratio of Branching Ratios	CLEO II (90% C.L.)
$\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^0\pi^0)/\mathcal{B}(B^- \to D^0\pi^-)$	< 0.09
$\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^0\rho^0)/\mathcal{B}(B^- \to D^0\rho^-)$	< 0.05
$\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^0\eta)/\mathcal{B}(B^- \to D^0\pi^-)$	< 0.12
$\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^0\eta')/\mathcal{B}(B^- \to D^0\pi^-)$	< 0.16
$\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^0\omega)/\mathcal{B}(B^- \to D^0\rho^-)$	< 0.05
$\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*0}\pi^0)/\mathcal{B}(B^- \to D^{*0}\pi^-)$	< 0.20
$\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*0}\rho^0)/\mathcal{B}(B^- \to D^{*0}\rho^-)$	< 0.07
$\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*0}\eta)/\mathcal{B}(B^- \to D^{*0}\pi^-)$	< 0.14
$\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*0}\eta')/\mathcal{B}(B^- \to D^{*0}\pi^-)$	< 0.54
$\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*0}\omega)/\mathcal{B}(B^- \to D^{*0}\rho^-)$	< 0.09

is determined by an unbinned fit to the ψ and K^* helicity angle distributions. The results obtained by the CLEO II, ARGUS and CDF collaborations are listed in Table XXXVIII. The efficiency corrected distributions in each of the helicity angles $\cos\Theta_\psi$ and $\cos\Theta_{K^*}$ are shown in Fig. 48 (CLEO II). Assuming that the systematic errors from the various experiments are uncorrelated, these three results can be averaged to obtain

$$\frac{\Gamma_L}{\Gamma} = 0.78 \pm 0.07 \tag{21}$$

Although the decay mode $B \to \psi K^*$ may not be completely polarized, it is still dominated by a single CP eigenstate. This mode will therefore be useful for measurements of CP violation.

C. Exclusive Decays to a $D^{0(*)}$ and a Neutral Meson.

We now discuss searches for B decays which can occur via an internal W-emission graph but which do not yield charmonium mesons in the final state. Naively, one expects that

TABLE XXXVIII. Longitudinal polarization of ψ mesons from $B \to \psi K^*$ decays.

Experiment	$\left(\frac{\Gamma_L}{\Gamma}\right)$
CLEO II	$0.80 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.05$
ARGUS [212]	$0.97 \pm 0.16 \pm 0.15$
CDF [213]	$0.66 \pm 0.10^{+0.08}_{-0.10}$
Average	0.78 ± 0.07

these decays will be suppressed relative to decays which occur via the external W-emission graph. For the internal graph, in the absence of gluons, the colors of the quarks from the virtual W must match the colors of the c quark and the accompanying spectator antiquark. In this simple picture, one expects that the suppression factor should be 1/18 in rate for decays involving π^0, ρ^0 and ω mesons [243]. In heavy quark decays the effects of gluons cannot be neglected, and QCD based calculations [235] predict suppression factors of order 1/50. If color suppressed B decay modes are not greatly suppressed then these modes could also be useful for CP violation studies [244].

CLEO II has searched for color suppressed decay modes of B mesons which contain a single D^0 or D^{*0} meson in the final state [245]. The relevant color suppressed modes are listed in Table XXXVI. The decay channels used are $\eta \to \gamma\gamma$, $\omega \to \pi^+\pi^-\pi^0$ and $\eta' \to \eta\pi^+\pi^-$, followed by $\eta \to \gamma\gamma$ [246]. For decays of a pseudoscalar meson into a final state containing a pseudoscalar and a vector meson (V), a helicity angle cut of $|\cos\Theta_V| > 0.4$ is used [248]. No signals were observed. Upper limits [249] on the branching ratios for color suppressed modes are given in Table XXXVI. Upper limits on the ratios of color suppressed modes to normalization modes are given in Table XXXVII. These limits show that there is color suppression of these B decay modes.

TABLE XXXIX. B^- Branching fractions [%]

Mode	ARGUS	CLEO 1.5	CLEO II
$B^- \to D^0\pi^-$	$0.22 \pm 0.09 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.01$	$0.56 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.02$	$0.53 \pm 0.04 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.02$
$B^- \to D^0\rho^-$	$1.41 \pm 0.43 \pm 0.39 \pm 0.06$		$1.31 \pm 0.12 \pm 0.14 \pm 0.04$
$B^- \to D^0\pi^+\pi^-\pi^-$		$1.24 \pm 0.31 \pm 0.14 \pm 0.05$	
$B^- \to D^{*0}\pi^-$	$0.38 \pm 0.13 \pm 0.10 \pm 0.02$	$1.00 \pm 0.25 \pm 0.18 \pm 0.04$	$0.49 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.06$
$B^- \to D^{*0}\rho^-$	$0.94 \pm 0.56 \pm 0.35 \pm 0.04$		$1.59 \pm 0.20 \pm 0.26 \pm 0.05$
$B^- \to D_J^{(*)0}\pi^-$	$0.13 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.01$	$0.13 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.01 \pm 0.01$	
$B^- \to D^{*+}\pi^-\pi^-\pi^0$	$1.64 \pm 0.64 \pm 0.37 \pm 0.07$		
$B^- \to D_J^{(*)0}\rho^-$	$0.32 \pm 0.19 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.01$		
$B^- \to D^{*0}\pi^-\pi^-\pi^+$			$0.92 \pm 0.20 \pm 0.17 \pm 0.01$
$B^- \to D^{*0}a_1^-$			$1.83 \pm 0.39 \pm 0.33 \pm 0.02$
$B^- \to D^+\pi^-\pi^-$			< 0.14 (90% C.L.)
$B^- \to D^{*+}\pi^-\pi^-$	$0.24 \pm 0.13 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.01$	< 0.37 (90% C.L.)	$0.18 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.01$
$B^- \to D^{**0}(2420)\pi^-$	$0.30 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.01$		$0.11 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.02 \pm 0.01$
$B^- \to D^{**0}(2420)\rho^-$			< 0.13 (90% C.L.)
$B^- \to D^{**0}(2460)\pi^-$			< 0.13 (90% C.L.)
$B^- \to D^{**0}(2460)\rho^-$			< 0.45 (90% C.L.)
$B^- \to D^0 D_s^-$	$1.69 \pm 0.85 \pm 0.27 \pm 0.41$	$1.66 \pm 0.70 \pm 0.13 \pm 0.40$	$1.11 \pm 0.20 \pm 0.23 \pm 0.28$
$B^- \to D^0 D_s^{*-}$	$1.13 \pm 0.85 \pm 0.20 \pm 0.27$		$0.79 \pm 0.25 \pm 0.15 \pm 0.19$
$B^- \to D^{*0} D_s^-$	$0.79 \pm 0.55 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.19$		$1.27 \pm 0.39 \pm 0.32 \pm 0.31$
$B^- \to D^{*0} D_s^{*-}$	$1.89 \pm 0.98 \pm 0.28 \pm 0.46$		$2.82 \pm 0.80 \pm 0.59 \pm 0.68$
$B^- \to \psi K^-$	$0.08 \pm 0.04 \pm 0.01$	$0.09 \pm 0.02 \pm 0.02$	$0.110 \pm 0.015 \pm 0.009$
$B^- \to \psi' K^-$	$0.20 \pm 0.09 \pm 0.04$	< 0.05 (90% C.L.)	$0.061 \pm 0.023 \pm 0.009$
$B^- \to \psi K^{*-}$	$0.19 \pm 0.13 \pm 0.03$	$0.15 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.03$	$0.178 \pm 0.051 \pm 0.023$
$B^- \to \psi' K^{*-}$	< 0.53 (90% C.L.)	< 0.38 (90% C.L.)	< 0.30 (90% C.L.)
$B^- \to \psi K^-\pi^+\pi^-$	< 0.19 (90% C.L.)	$0.14 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.03$	
$B^- \to \psi' K^-\pi^+\pi^-$	$0.21 \pm 0.12 \pm 0.04$		
$B^- \to \chi_{c1} K^-$	$0.22 \pm 0.15 \pm 0.07$		$0.097 \pm 0.040 \pm 0.009$
$B^- \to \chi_{c1} K^{*-}$			< 0.21 (90% C.L.)
$B^- \to \psi\pi^-$			$0.0047 \pm 0.0024 \pm 0.0004$

TABLE XL. $\bar{B}^0$ Branching fractions in [%]

Mode	ARGUS	CLEO 1.5	CLEO II
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\pi^-$	$0.48 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.03$	$0.27 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.02$	$0.29 \pm 0.04 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.02$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\rho^-$	$0.90 \pm 0.50 \pm 0.27 \pm 0.06$		$0.81 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.12 \pm 0.05$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\pi^-\pi^-\pi^+$		$0.81 \pm 0.21 \pm 0.09 \pm 0.05$	
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^-$	$0.25 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.01$	$0.45 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.02$	$0.25 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.04 \pm 0.01$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\rho^-$	$0.64 \pm 0.27 \pm 0.25 \pm 0.03$	$2.13 \pm 0.90 \pm 1.24 \pm 0.09$	$0.70 \pm 0.09 \pm 0.13 \pm 0.02$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^-\pi^-\pi^+$	$1.09 \pm 0.27 \pm 0.32 \pm 0.04$	$1.77 \pm 0.31 \pm 0.30 \pm 0.07$	$0.61 \pm 0.10 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.02$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}a_1^-$			$1.22 \pm 0.19 \pm 0.22 \pm 0.04$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^0\pi^+\pi^-$			< 0.16 (90% C.L.)
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{**+}(2460)\pi^-$			< 0.21 (90% C.L.)
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{**+}(2460)\rho^-$			< 0.47 (90% C.L.)
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^+D_s^-$	$1.05 \pm 0.80 \pm 0.35 \pm 0.26$	$0.54 \pm 0.31 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.13$	$0.82 \pm 0.23 \pm 0.19 \pm 0.20$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^+D_s^{*-}$	$1.67 \pm 1.05 \pm 0.52 \pm 0.41$		$0.95 \pm 0.33 \pm 0.21 \pm 0.23$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}D_s^-$	$0.83 \pm 0.59 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.20$	$1.17 \pm 0.66 \pm 0.09 \pm 0.28$	$0.85 \pm 0.21 \pm 0.15 \pm 0.21$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}D_s^{*-}$	$1.54 \pm 0.83 \pm 0.24 \pm 0.37$		$1.85 \pm 0.46 \pm 0.33 \pm 0.45$
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi K^0$	$0.09 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.02$	$0.07 \pm 0.04 \pm 0.02$	$0.075 \pm 0.024 \pm 0.008$
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi' K^0$	< 0.30 (90% C.L.)	< 0.16 (90% C.L.)	< 0.08 (90% C.L.)
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi \bar{K}^{*0}$	$0.13 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.02$	$0.13 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.03$	$0.169 \pm 0.031 \pm 0.018$
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi' \bar{K}^{*0}$	< 0.25 (90% C.L.)	$0.15 \pm 0.09 \pm 0.03$	< 0.19 (90% C.L.)
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi K^-\pi^+$		$0.12 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.03$	
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi' K^-\pi^+$	< 0.11 (90% C.L.)		
$\bar{B}^0 \to \chi_{c1} K^0$			< 0.27 (90% C.L.)
$\bar{B}^0 \to \chi_{c1} \bar{K}^{*0}$			< 0.21 (90% C.L.)
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi\pi^0$			< 0.0069 (90% C.L.)

TABLE XLI. World average B^- branching fractions [%]

Mode	Branching Fraction
$B^- \to D^0\pi^-$	$0.48 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.02$
$B^- \to D^0\rho^-$	$1.32 \pm 0.17 \pm 0.05$
$B^- \to D^0\pi^+\pi^-\pi^-$	$1.24 \pm 0.34 \pm 0.05$
$B^- \to D^{*0}\pi^-$	$0.50 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.02$
$B^- \to D^{*0}\rho^-$	$1.47 \pm 0.29 \pm 0.06$
$B^- \to D_J^{(*)0}\pi^-$	$0.13 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.01$
$B^- \to D^{*+}\pi^-\pi^-\pi^0$	$1.64 \pm 0.73 \pm 0.07$
$B^- \to D_J^{(*)0}\rho^-$	$0.32 \pm 0.20 \pm 0.01$
$B^- \to D^{*0}\pi^-\pi^-\pi^+$	$0.92 \pm 0.26 \pm 0.04$
$B^- \to D^{*0}a_1^-$	$1.83 \pm 0.51 \pm 0.07$
$B^- \to D^+\pi^-\pi^-$	< 0.14 (90% C.L.)
$B^- \to D^{*+}\pi^-\pi^-$	$0.19 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.01$
$B^- \to D^{**0}(2420)\pi^-$	$0.15 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.01$
$B^- \to D^{**0}(2420)\rho^-$	< 0.13 (90% C.L.)
$B^- \to D^{**0}(2460)\pi^-$	< 0.13 (90% C.L.)
$B^- \to D^{**0}(2460)\rho^-$	< 0.45 (90% C.L.)
$B^- \to D^0 D_s^-$	$1.24 \pm 0.27 \pm 0.30$
$B^- \to D^0 D_s^{*-}$	$0.83 \pm 0.28 \pm 0.20$
$B^- \to D^{*0} D_s^-$	$1.06 \pm 0.38 \pm 0.26$
$B^- \to D^{*0} D_s^{*-}$	$2.37 \pm 0.71 \pm 0.58$
$B^- \to \psi K^-$	0.102 ± 0.014
$B^- \to \psi' K^-$	0.070 ± 0.024
$B^- \to \psi K^{*-}$	0.174 ± 0.047
$B^- \to \psi' K^{*-}$	< 0.30 (90% C.L.)
$B^- \to \psi K^-\pi^+\pi^-$	0.140 ± 0.078
$B^- \to \psi' K^-\pi^+\pi^-$	0.207 ± 0.127
$B^- \to \chi_{c1} K^-$	0.104 ± 0.040
$B^- \to \chi_{c1} K^{*-}$	< 0.21 (90% C.L.)
$B^- \to \psi\pi^-$	0.0047 ± 0.0024

TABLE XLII. World average $\bar{B}^0$ branching fractions [%]

Mode	Branching Fraction
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\pi^-$	$0.30 \pm 0.04 \pm 0.02$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\rho^-$	$0.82 \pm 0.16 \pm 0.05$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\pi^-\pi^-\pi^+$	$0.81 \pm 0.23 \pm 0.05$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^-$	$0.27 \pm 0.04 \pm 0.01$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\rho^-$	$0.70 \pm 0.15 \pm 0.03$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^-\pi^-\pi^+$	$0.77 \pm 0.13 \pm 0.03$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}a_1^-$	$1.22 \pm 0.29 \pm 0.05$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^0\pi^+\pi^-$	< 0.16 (90% C.L.)
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{**+}(2460)\pi^-$	< 0.21 (90% C.L.)
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{**+}(2460)\rho^-$	< 0.47 (90% C.L.)
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^+D_s^-$	$0.71 \pm 0.21 \pm 0.17$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^+D_s^{*-}$	$1.02 \pm 0.37 \pm 0.25$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}D_s^-$	$0.88 \pm 0.22 \pm 0.21$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}D_s^{*-}$	$1.75 \pm 0.47 \pm 0.43$
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi K^0$	0.075 ± 0.021
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi' K^0$	< 0.08 (90% C.L.)
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi \bar{K}^{*0}$	0.153 ± 0.028
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi' \bar{K}^{*0}$	0.151 ± 0.091
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi K^-\pi^+$	0.117 ± 0.058
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi' K^-\pi^+$	< 0.11 (90% C.L.)
$\bar{B}^0 \to \chi_{c1} K^0$	< 0.27 (90% C.L.)
$\bar{B}^0 \to \chi_{c1} \bar{K}^{*0}$	< 0.21 (90% C.L.)
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi\pi^0$	< 0.007 (90% C.L.)

X. THEORETICAL INTERPRETATION OF HADRONIC B DECAY

A. Introduction

The simple spectator diagram for two-body hadronic B meson decays that occur through the CKM favored $b \to c$ transition is described by the Hamiltonian [250]:

$$H = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cb} \left\{ \left[(\bar{d}u) + (\bar{s}c) \right] (\bar{c}b) \right\} \tag{22}$$

where $(\bar{q}_i q_j) = \bar{q}_i \gamma_\mu (1-\gamma_5) q_j$, G_F is the Fermi coupling constant, and V_{cb} is the CKM matrix element.

The spectator diagram is modified by hard gluon exchange between the initial and final quark lines. The effect of these exchanges can be taken into account by use of the renormalization group, with the result that the original Hamiltonian of equation (22) is replaced by one which now contains two pieces, the original term multiplied by a coefficient $c_1(\mu)$, and an additional term multiplied by $c_2(\mu)$:

$$H_{eff} = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cb} \left\{ c_1(\mu) \left[(\bar{d}u) + (\bar{s}c) \right] (\bar{c}b) + c_2(\mu) \left[(\bar{c}u)(\bar{d}b) + (\bar{c}c)(\bar{s}b) \right] \right\} \tag{23}$$

The c_i are Wilson coefficients that can be calculated from QCD. However, the calculation is inherently uncertain because it is unclear at what mass scale, μ, these coefficients should be evaluated. The usual scale is taken to be $\mu \sim m_b^2$. Defining

$$c_\pm(\mu) = c_1(\mu) \pm c_2(\mu) \tag{24}$$

the leading-log approximation gives [235]

$$c_\pm(\mu) = \left(\frac{\alpha_s(M_W^2)}{\alpha_s(\mu)} \right)^{\frac{-6\gamma_\pm}{(33-2n_f)}} \tag{25}$$

where $\gamma_- = -2\gamma_+ = 2$, and n_f is the number of active flavors, which is taken to be five in this case.

The additional term in the Hamiltonian in Eq. (23) corresponds to the "color suppressed" diagram. The quark pairings in this diagram are different from those in the spectator diagram, and lead to the decay modes discussed in section IX. From the observation of the $B \to \psi X_s$ decays, where X_s is a strange meson, the magnitude of the color-suppressed term can be deduced. In B^- decays, both spectator and color-suppressed diagrams are present and can interfere. By comparing the rates for B^- and $\bar{B}^0$ decays, both the size and the relative sign of the color-suppressed term can be determined (see Sec. XII B).

For comparisons between theoretical models and data we will use the following values for couplings and lifetimes:

$$\begin{aligned} |V_{cb}| &= 0.0386 \pm 0.0027 \\ \frac{|V_{ub}|}{|V_{cb}|} &= 0.073 \pm 0.011 \pm 0.010 \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

$$\tau_B^0 = (1.621 \pm 0.067) \text{ ps}$$
$$\tau_B^+ = (1.646 \pm 0.063) \text{ ps}$$
$$< \tau_B > = (1.634 \pm 0.046) \text{ ps}$$

$< \tau_B >$ is the average lifetime for a sample consisting of equal numbers of B^- and $\bar{B}^0$ mesons.

B. Factorization

Factorization is the assumption that two body hadronic decays of B mesons can be expressed as the product of two independent hadronic currents, one describing the formation of a meson from the converted b quark and the light spectator quark, and the other describing the production of a meson by the hadronization of the virtual W^-. This description is expected to be valid for the external spectator decays where the large energy carried by the W^- causes the products of the W^- to be well separated from the spectator quark system [13], [251]. It has also been used to calculate color-suppressed and penguin diagrams, although it is not known whether factorization is a correct assumption for these diagrams.

There are number of tests of the factorization hypothesis that can be made by comparing rates and polarizations for semileptonic and hadronic B decays. These will be discussed in section XI. If factorization holds, then measurements of hadronic B decays can be compared to the theoretical models, and used to extract fundamental parameters of the Standard Model. For instance the CKM matrix element $|V_{ub}|$ could be obtained from $\bar{B}^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$ or $\bar{B}^0 \to D_s^-\pi^+$, and the decay constant f_{D_s} could be determined from $\bar{B}^0 \to D_s^- D^{*+}$.

C. Phenomenological Models of Hadronic B Decay

Several groups have developed models of hadronic B decays based on the factorization approach. To compute rates for all hadronic B decays the magnitude and sign of the color amplitude must also be known. It is difficult to calculate this amplitude from first principles in QCD. Instead a phenomenological approach was adopted by Bauer, Stech and Wirbel [252], in which two undetermined coefficients were assigned to the effective charged current, a_1, and the effective neutral current, a_2, parts of the B decay Hamiltonian. In reference [252] these coefficients were determined from a fit to a subset of the experimental data on charm decays. The values of a_1 and a_2 can be related to the QCD coefficients c_1 and c_2 by

$$a_1 = c_1 + \xi c_2, \quad a_2 = c_2 + \xi c_1 \tag{27}$$

where $\xi = 1/N_{\text{color}}$. The values

$$a_1 = 1.26, \quad a_2 = -0.51 \tag{28}$$

that give the best fit to the experimental data on charm decay correspond to $1/N_{\text{color}} \sim 0$ [235]. However, there is no convincing theoretical justification for this choice of N_{color}. In section XII B we will discuss the experimental determination of the values of a_1 and a_2 from a fit to the B meson decay data.

D. Heavy Quark Effective Theory

The evaluation of amplitudes for hadronic decays requires not only the assumption of factorization, but also the input of hadronic form factors and meson decay constants. As a result of the development of HQET it is now believed that many of the hadronic form factors for $b \to c$ transitions can be calculated quite well in an essentially model-independent way. This has been done by several groups [235], [254]. The comparison of these theoretical predictions with the experimental results can be used to test the range of validity of HQET, and the extent to which $1/M_Q$ corrections to the heavy quark symmetry are needed.

XI. TESTS OF THE FACTORIZATION HYPOTHESIS

A. Branching Ratio Tests

The large samples of reconstructed hadronic B decays have made possible the precise measurements of branching ratios discussed in section VIII. As an example of the use of these results to test the factorization hypothesis we will consider the specific case of $\bar{B^0} \to D^{*+}\pi^-$. The amplitude for this reaction is

$$A = \frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} V_{cb} V_{ud}^* \langle \pi^- | (\bar{d}u) | 0 \rangle \langle D^{*+} | (\bar{c}b) | \bar{B^0} \rangle. \tag{29}$$

The CKM factor $|V_{ud}|$ arises from the $W^- \to \bar{u}d$ vertex. The first hadron current that creates the π^- from the vacuum is related to the pion decay constant, f_π, by:

$$\langle \pi^-(p) | (\bar{d}u) | 0 \rangle = -i f_\pi p_\mu. \tag{30}$$

The other hadron current can be found from the semileptonic decay $\bar{B^0} \to D^{*+}\ell^-\bar{\nu}_\ell$. Here the amplitude is the product of a lepton current and the hadron current that we seek to insert in Eq. (29). Factorization can be tested experimentally by verifying whether the relation

$$\frac{\Gamma\left(\bar{B^0} \to D^{*+}\pi^-\right)}{\left.\frac{d\Gamma}{dq^2}\left(\bar{B^0} \to D^{*+}\ell^-\bar{\nu_l}\right)\right|_{q^2=m_\pi^2}} = 6\pi^2 c_1^2 f_\pi^2 |V_{ud}|^2, \tag{31}$$

is satisfied. Here q^2 is the four momentum transfer from the B meson to the D^* meson. Since q^2 is also the mass of the lepton-neutrino system, by setting $q^2 = m_\pi^2 = 0.019\ GeV^2$ we are requiring that the lepton-neutrino system has the same kinematic properties as does the pion in the hadronic decay. V_{ud} and f_π have well measured values of 0.975 and 131.7 MeV respectively. For the coefficient c_1 we will use the value 1.12 ± 0.1 deduced from perturbative QCD [255]. The error in c_1 reflects the uncertainty in the mass scale at which the coefficient c_1 should be evaluated. In the original test of equation (31), Bortoletto and Stone [256] found that the equation was satisfied for c_1=1. In the following discussion we will denote the left hand side of Eq. (31) by R_{Exp} and the right hand side by R_{Theo}.

This type of factorization test can be extended to larger q^2 values by using other $\bar{B^0} \to D^{*+}X^-$ decays, e.g. $X^- = \rho^-$ or a_1^-. For the ρ^- case Eq. (31) becomes:

$$R = \frac{\Gamma(\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\rho^-)}{\frac{d\Gamma}{dq^2}(B \to D^*\ l\ \nu)|_{q^2=m_\rho^2}} = 6\pi^2 c_1^2 f_\rho^2 |V_{ud}|^2 \tag{32}$$

where the semileptonic decay is evaluated at $q^2 = m_\rho^2 = 0.60$ GeV^2. The decay constant on the right hand side of this equation can be determined from $e^+e^- \to \rho^0$ which gives $f_\rho = 215 \pm 4$ MeV. A second method uses the relation $\Gamma(\tau^- \to \nu\rho^-) = 0.804 \frac{G_F^2}{16\pi} |V_{ud}^2| M_\tau^3 f_\rho^2$, where the ρ width has been taken into account [257]. This gives $f_\rho = 212.0 \pm 5.3$ MeV [258]. For the factorization test with $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}a_1^-$ we use $f_{a_1} = 205 \pm 16$ MeV [261] determined from τ decay.

To derive numerical predictions for the left hand side of equation (31), we must interpolate the observed differential q^2 distribution [262] for $B \to D^*\ell\ \nu$ to $q^2 = m_\pi^2$, m_ρ^2, and $m_{a_1}^2$, respectively. Until this distribution is measured more precisely we have to use theoretical models to perform this interpolation. The $d\Gamma/dq^2$ distribution obtained in a recent CLEO II analysis [40] is shown in Fig. 49. The solid and dashed lines represent fits to different models. The differences between the extrapolations using models for $B \to D^*\ell\ \nu$ are small, on the order of 10-20%. The measurement of this differential distribution from CLEO II can be combined with the earlier results from the ARGUS and CLEO 1.5 experiments [256,260]. The values of $d\Gamma/dq^2(B \to D^*\ell\nu)$ used for the factorization test are given in Table XLIII. The statistical and systematic errors have been combined in quadrature; the uncertainty due to the D^0 branching ratios cancels in the ratio. Using the information listed in Table XLIII

TABLE XLIII. Ingredients for Factorization Tests.

$\|c_1\|$	1.12 ± 0.1
f_π	131.74 ± 0.15 MeV
f_ρ	215 ± 4 MeV
f_{a_1}	205 ± 16 MeV
V_{ud} [25]	0.9744 ± 0.0010
$\frac{d\mathcal{B}}{dq^2}(B \to D^*\ell\ \nu)\|_{q^2=m_\pi^2}$	$(0.237 \pm 0.026)\ \times 10^{-2}$ GeV^{-2}
$\frac{d\mathcal{B}}{dq^2}(B \to D^*\ell\ \nu)\|_{q^2=m_\rho^2}$	$(0.250 \pm 0.030)\ \times 10^{-2}$ GeV^{-2}
$\frac{d\mathcal{B}}{dq^2}(B \to D^*\ell\ \nu)\|_{q^2=m_{a_1}^2})$	$(0.335 \pm 0.033)\ \times 10^{-2}$ GeV^{-2}
$\frac{d\mathcal{B}}{dq^2}(B \to D^*\ell\ \nu)\|_{q^2=m_{D_s}^2}$	$(0.483 \pm 0.033)\ \times 10^{-2}$ GeV^{-2}
$\frac{d\mathcal{B}}{dq^2}(B \to D^*\ell\ \nu)\|_{q^2=m_{D_s^*}^2}$	$(0.507 \pm 0.035)\ \times 10^{-2}$ GeV^{-2}

we obtain from Eqs. (31) and (32) the results given in Table XLIV. Some of the systematic

TABLE XLIV. Comparison of R_{Exp} and R_{Theo}

	R_{Exp} (GeV^2)	R_{Theo} (GeV^2)
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^-$	1.14 ± 0.21	1.22 ± 0.15
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\rho^-$	2.80 ± 0.69	3.26 ± 0.42
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}a_1^-$	3.6 ± 0.9	3.0 ± 0.50

uncertainties in R_{Exp} cancel if we form ratios of branching fractions, as does the QCD coefficient c_1 in R_{Theo}. Thus in the case of $D^{*+}\rho^-/D^{*+}\pi^-$, the expectation from factorization

FIG. 49. The $d\Gamma/dq^2$ distribution for $\bar{B} \to D^* \ell \bar{\nu}$ decays from CLEO II data (from Ref. [40]). The solid lines represent fits to the CLEO II data based on HQET. The upper solid line corresponds to a linear extrapolation near the endpoint, and the lower solid line corresponds to a quadratic extrapolation. The dashed line shows $d\Gamma/dq^2$ for the ISGW model, the dotted line is the BSW model.

is given by $R_{Theo}(\rho)/R_{Theo}(\pi)$ times the ratio of the semileptonic branching ratios evaluated at the appropriate q^2 values. In Table XLV we show the comparison between the measured ratios and two theoretical predictions by Reader and Isgur [261], and the revised BSW model [235]. At the present level of precision, there is good agreement between the experimental

TABLE XLV. Ratios of B decay widths.

	Exp.	Factorization	RI Model	BSW Model
$\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\rho^-)/\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^-)$	2.59 ± 0.67	2.81 ± 0.46	2.2 – 2.3	2.8
$\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}a_1^-)/\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^-)$	4.5 ± 1.2	3.4 ± 0.6	2.0 – 2.1	3.4

results and the expectation from factorization for the q^2 range $0 < q^2 < m_{a_1}^2$. Note that it is possible that factorization will be a poorer approximation for decays will smaller energy release or larger q^2. Factorization tests can be extended to higher q^2 using $B \to D^* D_s^{(*)}$ decays as will be discussed in section XI D .

B. Factorization and Angular Correlations

More subtle tests of the factorization hypothesis can be performed by examining the polarization in B meson decays into two vector mesons, as suggested by Körner and Goldstein [264]. Again, the underlying principle is to compare the hadronic decays to the appropriate semileptonic decays evaluated at a fixed value in q^2. For instance, the ratio of longitudinal to transverse polarization (Γ_L/Γ_T) in $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\rho^-$ should be equal to the corresponding ratio for $B \to D^*\ell\nu$ evaluated at $q^2 = {m_\rho}^2 = 0.6$ GeV^2.

$$\frac{\Gamma_L}{\Gamma_T}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\rho^-) = \frac{\Gamma_L}{\Gamma_T}(B \to D^*\ell\nu)|_{q^2=m_\rho^2} \tag{33}$$

The advantage of this method is that it is not affected by QCD corrections [265].

For $B \to D^*\ell\nu$ decay, longitudinal polarization dominates at low q^2, whereas near $q^2 = q^2_{\rm max}$ transverse polarization dominates. There is a simple physical argument for the behaviour of the form factors near these two kinematic limits. Near $q^2 = q^2_{\rm max}$, the D^* is almost at rest and its small velocity is uncorrelated with the D^* spin, so all three D^* helicities are equally likely and we expect $\Gamma_T/\Gamma_L = 2$. At $q^2 = 0$, the D^* has the maximum possible momentum, while the lepton and neutrino are collinear and travel in the direction opposite to the D^*. The lepton and neutrino helicities are aligned to give $S_z = 0$, so near $q^2 = 0$ longitudinal polarization is dominant.

For $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\rho^-$, we expect 88% longitudinal polarization from the argument described above [266]. Similar results have been obtained by Neubert [267], Rieckert [268], and Kramer *et al.* [269].

Fig. 50 shows the prediction of Neubert for transverse and longitudinal polarization in $B \to D^*\ell\nu$ decays. Using this figure we find Γ_L/Γ to be 85% at $q^2 = {m_\rho}^2 = 0.6$. The agreement between these predictions and the experimental result (Sec. VIII C)

$$\Gamma_L/\Gamma \;=\; 90 \pm 7 \pm 5\% \tag{34}$$

supports the factorization hypothesis in hadronic B meson decay for q^2 values up to m_ρ^2.

Factorization breaks down in the charm sector due to the presence of final state interactions, "FSI". The strength of these long distance effects in the B system can be determined by performing an isospin analysis of related decay channels such as $B^- \to D^0\pi^-$, $\bar{B}^0 \to D^0\pi^0$, and $\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\pi^-$ as was done in the past for the $D \to K\pi$ and $D \to K^*\pi$ systems. At the present level of experimental precision, there is no evidence for non-zero isospin phase shifts in B decay From a maximum likelihood fit to the observed branching fractions, Yamamoto finds that $\cos\delta^* > 0.82$ at the 90% confidence level, where δ^* is the phase shift for the $B \to D\pi$ system and comparable constraints, $\cos\delta^* > 0.57(0.92)$, for the $B \to D^*\pi$ ($B \to D\rho$) isospin multiplets [270]. In B decays to two vector mesons, such as $B \to D^*\rho$, the presence of final state interaction could also be probed by studying the angle, χ, between the D^* and ρ decay planes. FSI would cause a phase shift between the helicity amplitudes and break the symmetry of the χ distribution. The presence of FSI would lead to a angular distribution proportional to $\sin\chi$ or $\sin 2\chi$ [271].

Until the D_s decay constant, f_{D_s}, is measured more precisely, e.g. in $D_s \to \mu\nu$, tests of the factorization hypothesis based on branching fractions cannot be applied to $B \to D^*D_s$

FIG. 50. The differential branching ratio for $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\ell\bar{\nu}_\ell$. The curves show the theoretical prediction for producing transversely (dashed) and longitudinally (dash-dotted) polarized D^* mesons, as well as the total decay rate (solid) (from Ref. [267]).

decays. However, CLEO II has accumulated about 20 events in the $B^- \to D^{*0}D_s^{*-}$ and $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}D_s^{*-}$ modes. As the data sample increases, it will become possible to measure the polarization in these decay modes and investigate whether factorization is still a valid assumption at $q^2 = m_{D_s}^2$.

C. Tests of Spin Symmetry in HQET

In HQET the effect of the heavy quark magnetic moment does not enter to lowest order [272], and the assumption of factorization leads to the following predictions based on the spin symmetry of HQET:

$$\Gamma(\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\pi^-) = \Gamma(\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^-) \tag{35}$$

and

$$\Gamma(\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\rho^-) = \Gamma(\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\rho^-). \tag{36}$$

After correcting for phase space and deviations from heavy quark symmetry it is predicted that $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\pi^-) = 1.03\ \mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^-)$ and $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\rho^-) = 0.89\ \mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\rho^-)$. A separate calculation by Blok and Shifman using a QCD sum rule approach predicts that $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\pi^-) = 1.2\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^-)$. This differs from the HQET prediction due to the presence of non-factorizable contributions [273].

From the experimental data we find

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\pi^-)}{\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^-)} \;=\; 1.11 \pm 0.22 \pm 0.08 \tag{37}$$

and

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\rho^-)}{\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\rho^-)} \;=\; 1.06 \pm 0.27 \pm 0.08 \tag{38}$$

The second error is due to the uncertainty in the D branching fractions. The two ratios of branching fractions are consistent with the expectations from HQET spin symmetry as well as with the prediction from Blok and Shifman that includes non-factorizable contributions.

Mannel *et al.* [272] observe that by using a combination of HQET, factorization, and data on $B \to D^*\ \ell\ \nu$, they can obtain model dependent predictions for $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\rho^-)/\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\pi^-)$. Using three parameterizations of the universal Isgur-Wise form factor [274], they predict this ratio to be 3.05, 2.52, or 2.61. From the measurements of the branching ratios we obtain

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\rho^-)}{\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\pi^-)} \;=\; 2.7 \pm 0.6 \tag{39}$$

The systematic errors from the D branching fractions cancel in this ratio. Again we find good agreement with the prediction from HQET combined with factorization.

Similar comparisons can be performed for $B \to D^{(*)}D_s^{(*)}$ decay modes. Using isospin invariance to combine the $\bar{B}^0 \to D^+ D_s^{(*-)}$ and $B^- \to D^0\ D_s^{(*-)}$ decay modes, we obtain

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \to D D_s^-)}{\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \to D^* D_s^-)} \;=\; 0.94 \pm 0.35 \tag{40}$$

The predicted range for this ratio is $1.35 - 1.56$ [39].

Similarly,

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \to D D_s^{*-})}{\mathcal{B}(\bar{B} \to D^* D_s^{*-})} \;=\; 0.46 \pm 0.19 \tag{41}$$

In this case, the additional helicity states available leads to the expectation that this ratio will lie in the range $0.33 - 0.39$ [39].

D. Applications of Factorization

If factorization holds, hadronic B decays can be used to extract information about semileptonic decays. For example, we can determine the poorly measured rate $B \to D^{**}(2420)\ \ell\ \nu$ from the branching ratio of $B \to D^{**}(2420)\pi$. By assuming that the rate for $B \to D^{**}(2420)\pi$ is related to $d\Gamma/dq^2(B \to D^{**}(2420)\ell\nu)$ evaluated at $q^2 = m_\pi^2$. Using the model of Colangelo *et al.* [254] to determine the shape of the form factors we obtain the ratio

$$\frac{\Gamma(B \to D^{**}(2420)\ \ell\ \nu)}{\Gamma(B \to D^{**}(2420)\pi)} = 3.2$$

Combining this with the experimental result, $\mathcal{B}(B^- \to D^{**0}(2420)\pi^-) = 0.15 \pm 0.05\,\%$, (Table XLI) we predict $\mathcal{B}(D^{**}(2420)\ell\nu) = 0.48 \pm 0.16\%$. This is consistent with the average of recent direct measurements by OPAL and ALEPH (Table XIV), $\mathcal{B}(D^{**}(2420)\ell\nu) = 0.82 \pm 0.18 \pm 0.06\%$.

A second application of factorization is the determination of f_{D_s} using the decays $B \to D^* D_s$. The rate for $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+} D_s$ is related to the differential rate for $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\ell^-\nu$ at $q^2 = m_{D_s}^2$ if factorization continues to be valid at larger values of q^2:

$$\frac{\Gamma\left(\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+} D_s^-\right)}{\left.\frac{d\Gamma}{dq^2}\left(\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\ell^-\nu\right)\right|_{q^2=m_{D_s}^2}} = 6\pi^2\delta\; c_1^2 f_{D_s}^2 |V_{cs}|^2, \tag{42}$$

The factor $\delta = 0.37$ accounts for the different form factors which enter in $B \to D^* D_s$ and $B \to D^*\ell\nu$ [235].

Using the value listed in Table XLIII for $d\Gamma/dq^2(B \to D^*\ell\nu)$ at $q^2 = m_{D_s}^2$ and the average branching ratio for $\mathcal{B}(B \to D^* D_s^-) = 0.93 \pm 0.25\%$, we obtain

$$f_{D_s} = (271 \pm 77)\sqrt{3.7\%/B(D_s \to \phi\pi^+)}\ \text{MeV}$$

and with $\mathcal{B}(B \to D^* D_s^{*-}) = 1.95 \pm 0.52\%$, we find ($\delta = 1$)

$$f_{D_s^*} = (248 \pm 69)\sqrt{3.7\%/B(D_s \to \phi\pi^+)}\ \text{MeV}$$

This result can be compared to the value

$$f_{D_s} = (344 \pm 37 \pm 52)\sqrt{B(D_s \to \phi\pi^+)/3.7\%}\ \text{MeV}$$

that was obtained from a direct measurement of $D_s \to \mu\nu$ decays in continuum charm events [51]. Both values of f_{D_s} are consistent with theoretical predictions which are in the range $f_{D_s} = 200 - 290$ MeV [275], [276], [277]. If both the $D_s^+ \to \phi\pi^+$ branching fraction and f_{D_s} are measured more precisely, then measurements of the branching ratios of $B \to D^* D_s$ decays can be used to test factorization in B decay at $q^2 = m_{D_s}^2$. In the near future, it will also be possible to test factorization in this q^2 range by measuring Γ_L/Γ in $B \to D^* D_s^*$ decays.

E. Factorization in Color Suppressed Decay

It is not obvious whether the factorization hypothesis will be satisfied in decays which proceed via internal W-emission e.g $B \to \psi K^{(*)}$. Two observables have been compared to phenomenological models based on the factorization hypothesis: the ratio of vector to pseudoscalar modes and the polarization in $B \to \psi K^*$ decays.

The ratio of vector to pseudoscalar meson production

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}(B \to \psi K^*)}{\mathcal{B}(B \to \psi K)} = 1.68 \pm 0.33 \tag{43}$$

can be calculated using factorization and the ratio of the $B \to K^*$ and $B \to K$ form factors. The revised BSW model of Neubert *et al.* [235] predicts a value of 1.61 for this ratio, which is close to the experimental value. Another test is the corresponding ratio for $\psi^{'}$ decays:

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}(B \to \psi' K^*)}{\mathcal{B}(B \to \psi' K)} = 2.1 \pm 1.5 \tag{44}$$

This can be compared to the revised BSW model which predicts 1.85 for this ratio. Gourdin *et al.* [240] argue, that the ratio $\mathcal{B}(B \to \eta_c K^*)/\mathcal{B}(B \to \eta_c K)$ would provide a good test of the factorization hypothesis in internal spectator decays. However, this will require a significantly larger data sample than is available at present before this ratio can be measured with sufficient precision. Other ratios of decay rates in modes with charmonium mesons may also be used to test for the violation of factorization [238].

The experimental results on ψK^* polarization can be compared to the theoretical predictions of Kramer and Palmer [236] which depend on the assumption of factorization and on the unmeasured $B \to K^*$ form factor. Using the BSW model to estimate the form factors, they find $\Gamma_L/\Gamma = 0.57$. Using HQET to extrapolate from the E691 measurements of the $D \to K^*$ form factor, they obtain $\Gamma_L/\Gamma = 0.73$. The group of Gourdin, Kamal and Pham as well as the collaboration of Aleksan, Le Yauoanc, Oliver, Pène, and Raynal have noted that there is no set of experimental or theoretical form factors that can simultaneously reproduce the measured values of Γ_L/Γ and $\mathcal{B}(B \to \psi K^*)/\mathcal{B}(B \to \psi K)$ [237], [239]. They conclude that there is either a fundamental problem in heavy to light form factors or a breakdown of factorization for this class of decay modes. Kamal and Santra have suggested that all the measured observables in exclusive $B \to \psi$ can be accommodated with a single non-factorizable amplitude [241].

CLEO also finds evidence at the 2.5 standard deviation level for $B \to \chi_{c2}$ transitions at a branching ratio of $0.25 \pm 0.10 \pm 0.03\%$. If confirmed, this would indicate the presence of either non-factorizable color octet contributions which are neglected in the usual treatment of hadronic B decays or higher order processes $O(\alpha_s^2)$ in $b \to c\bar{c}s$ decays [215].

XII. DETERMINATION OF THE COLOR SUPPRESSED AMPLITUDE

A. Color Suppression in B Decay

In the decays of charmed mesons the effect of color suppression is obscured by the effects of final state interactions (FSI), and soft gluon effects which enhance W exchange diagrams. Table XLVI gives ratios of several charmed meson decay modes with approximately equal phase space factors where the mode in the numerator is color suppressed while the mode in the denominator is an external spectator decay. With the exception of the decay $D^0 \to \bar{K}^0 \rho^0$ it is clear that the color suppressed decays do not have significantly smaller branching ratios.

When the BSW model is used to fit the data on charm decays it gives values of $a_1 = 1.26$ and $a_2 = -0.51$. The BSW model assumes that the values of the coefficients can be extrapolated from $\mu = m_c^2$ to $\mu = m_b^2$ taking into account the evolution of the strong coupling constant α_s. This extrapolation gives the predictions $a_1 = 1.1$ and $a_2 = -0.24$ for B decays.

TABLE XLVI. Measured Ratios of color suppressed to external spectator branching fractions.

Mode	Branching fraction [25]
$\mathcal{B}(D^0 \to \bar{K}^0\rho^0)/\mathcal{B}(D^0 \to K^-\rho^+)$	0.08 ± 0.04
$\mathcal{B}(D^0 \to K^0\pi^0)/\mathcal{B}(D^0 \to K^-\pi^+)$	0.57 ± 0.13
$\mathcal{B}(D^0 \to \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^0)/\mathcal{B}(D^0 \to K^{*-}\pi^+)$	0.47 ± 0.23
$\mathcal{B}(D^0 \to \pi^0\pi^0)/\mathcal{B}(D^0 \to \pi^-\pi^+)$	0.77 ± 0.25
$\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \to \bar{K}^{*0}K^+)/\mathcal{B}(D_s \to \phi\pi^+)$	0.95 ± 0.10
$\mathcal{B}(D_s^+ \to \bar{K}^0K^+)/\mathcal{B}(D_s \to \phi\pi^+)$	1.01 ± 0.16

The smaller magnitude of a_2 means that in contrast to the charm sector one expects to find a more consistent pattern of color suppression in B meson decays. Another approach uses the factorization hypothesis, HQET and model dependent form factors (RI model) [261]. In this approach, a_1 and a_2 are determined from QCD (with $1/N_{\rm color} = 1/3$), and color suppressed B decays are expected to occur at about 1/1000 the rate of unsuppressed decays. In Section IX C we obtained upper limits for color suppressed B decays with a D^0 or D^{*0} meson in the final state. In Table XLVII these results are compared to the predictions of the BSW and the RI models.

TABLE XLVII. Branching fractions of color suppressed B decays and comparisons with models.

Decay Mode	U. L. (%)	BSW (%)	$\mathcal{B}$ (BSW)	RI model(%)
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^0\pi^0$	< 0.048	0.012	$0.20a_2^2(f_D/220\text{MeV})^2$	$0.0013 - 0.0018$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^0\rho^0$	< 0.055	0.008	$0.14a_2^2(f_D/220\text{MeV})^2$	0.00044
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^0\eta$	< 0.068	0.006	$0.11a_2^2(f_D/220\text{MeV})^2$	
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^0\eta'$	< 0.086	0.002	$0.03a_2^2(f_D/220\text{MeV})^2$	
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^0\omega$	< 0.063	0.008	$0.14a_2^2(f_D/220\text{MeV})^2$	
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*0}\pi^0$	< 0.097	0.012	$0.21a_2^2(f_{D*}/220\text{MeV})^2$	$0.0013 - 0.0018$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*0}\rho^0$	< 0.117	0.013	$0.22a_2^2(f_{D*}/220\text{MeV})^2$	$0.0013 - 0.0018$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*0}\eta$	< 0.069	0.007	$0.12a_2^2(f_{D*}/220\text{MeV})^2$	
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*0}\eta'$	< 0.27	0.002	$0.03a_2^2(f_{D*}/220\text{MeV})^2$	
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*0}\omega$	< 0.21	0.013	$0.22a_2^2(f_{D*}/220\text{MeV})^2$	

In contrast to charm decay, color suppression seems to be operative in hadronic decays of B mesons. The limits on the color suppressed modes with $D^{0(*)}$ and neutral mesons are still above the level expected by the two models, but we can already exclude a prediction by Terasaki [278] that $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^0\pi^0) \approx 1.8\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\pi^-)$. To date, the only color suppressed B meson decay modes that have been observed are final states which contain charmonium mesons e.g. $B \to \psi K$ and $B \to \psi K^*$ [279].

B. Determination of $|a_1|$, $|a_2|$ and the Relative Sign of (a_2/a_1)

In the BSW model [235], the branching fractions of the $\bar{B}^0$ normalization modes are proportional to a_1^2 while the branching fractions of the $B \to \psi$ decay modes depend only

on a_2^2. A fit to the branching ratios for the modes $\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\pi^-$, $D^+\rho^-$, $D^{*+}\pi^-$ and $D^{*+}\rho^-$ using the model of Neubert *et al.* yields

$$|a_1| = 1.03 \pm 0.04 \pm 0.06 \tag{45}$$

and a fit to the modes with ψ mesons in the final state gives

$$|a_2| = 0.23 \pm 0.01 \pm 0.01 \tag{46}$$

The first error on $|a_1|$ and $|a_2|$ includes the uncertainties from the charm or charmonium branching ratios, the experimental systematics associated with detection efficiencies and background subtractions as well as the statistical errors from the branching ratios. The second error quoted is the uncertainty due to the B meson production fractions and lifetimes. We have assumed that the ratio of B^+B^- and $B^0\bar{B}^0$ production at the $\Upsilon(4S)$ is one [40], and assigned an uncertainty of 10% to it.

The magnitude of the amplitude for external spectator processes, $|a_1|$ can also be determined from $B \to D^{(*)}D_s^{(*)}$ decays. Since these transitions are not subject to interference with the internal spectator amplitude we can combine B^- and $\bar{B}^0$ decays to reduce the statistical error. Using the average branching fractions given in Tables XLI, XLII we obtain

$$|a_1|_{DD_s} = 0.93 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.04 \tag{47}$$

It is interesting to note that this value of $|a_1|$ agrees with the result of the fit to the $B \to D^{(*)}\pi$ and $B \to D^{(*)}\rho$ modes (see 45). In general, $|a_1|$ could be different for exclusive $b \to c\bar{u}d$ and $b \to c\bar{c}s$ processes.

By comparing branching ratios of B^- and $\bar{B}^0$ decay modes it is possible to determine the the sign of a_2 relative to a_1. The BSW model, [235] predicts the following ratios:

$$R_1 = \frac{\mathcal{B}(B^- \to D^0\pi^-)}{\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\pi^-)} = (1 + 1.23a_2/a_1)^2 \tag{48}$$

$$R_2 = \frac{\mathcal{B}(B^- \to D^0\rho^-)}{\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\rho^-)} = (1 + 0.66a_2/a_1)^2 \tag{49}$$

$$R_3 = \frac{\mathcal{B}(B^- \to D^{*0}\pi^-)}{\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^-)} = (1 + 1.29a_2/a_1)^2 \tag{50}$$

$$R_4 = \frac{\mathcal{B}(B^- \to D^{*0}\rho^-)}{\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\rho^-)} \approx (1 + 0.75a_2/a_1)^2 \tag{51}$$

Table XLIX shows a comparison between the experimental results and the two allowed solutions in the BSW model. In the experimental ratios the systematic errors due to detection efficiencies partly cancel. In the ratios R_3 and R_4 the D meson branching ratio uncertainties do not contribute to the systematic error.

A least squares fit to the ratios R_1 - R_3 gives

TABLE XLVIII. Predicted branching fractions in terms of BSW parameters a_1, a_2. The coefficients have been rescaled to accommodate the new B lifetime and $|V_{cb}|$ values given in equation 27 and $f_D = f_{D^*} = 220$ MeV.

Mode	Neubert *et al.* [235]	Deandrea *et al.* [280]
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\pi^-$	$0.264a_1^2$	$0.278a_1^2$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\rho^-$	$0.621a_1^2$	$0.717a_1^2$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^-$	$0.254a_1^2$	$0.278a_1^2$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\rho^-$	$0.702a_1^2$	$0.949a_1^2$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^+D_s^-$	$1.213a_1^2$	$1.094a_1^2$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^+D_s^{(*-)}$	$0.859a_1^2$	$0.745a_1^2$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}D_s^-$	$0.824a_1^2$	$0.768a_1^2$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}D_s^{(*-)}$	$2.203a_1^2$	$2.862a_1^2$
$B^- \to D^0\pi^-$	$0.265[a_1 + 1.230a_2(f_D/220)]^2$	$0.278[a_1 + 1.12655a_2(f_D/220)]^2$
$B^- \to D^0\rho^-$	$0.622[a_1 + 0.662a_2\ (f_D/220)]^2$	$0.717[a_1 + 0.458a_2(f_D/220)]^2$
$B^- \to D^{*0}\pi^-$	$0.255[a_1 + 1.292a_2\ (f_{D^*}/220)]^2$	$0.278[a_1 + 1.524a_2(f_{D^*}/220)]^2$
$B^- \to D^{*0}\rho^-$	$0.703[a_1^2 + 1.487a_1a_2\ (f_{D^*}/220)$ $+0.635a_2^2(f_{D^*}/220)^2]$	$0.949[a_1^2 + 1.31a_1a_2\ (f_{D^*}/220)$ $+0.53a_2^2(f_{D^*}/220)^2]$
$B^- \to D^0D_s^-$	$1.215a_1^2$	$1.094a_1^2$
$B^- \to D^0D_s^{(*-)}$	$0.862a_1^2$	$0.745a_1^2$
$B^- \to D^{*0}D_s^-$	$0.828a_1^2$	$0.768a_1^2$
$B^- \to D^{*0}D_s^{(*-)}$	$2.206a_1^2$	$2.862a_1^2$
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi\bar{K}^0$	$1.817a_2^2$	$1.652a_2^2$
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi\bar{K}^{*0}$	$2.927a_2^2$	$2.420a_2^2$
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi'\bar{K}^0$	$1.065a_2^2$	$0.559a_2^2$
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi'\bar{K}^{*0}$	$1.965a_2^2$	$1.117a_2^2$
$B^- \to \psi K^-$	$1.819a_2^2$	$1.652a_2^2$
$B^- \to \psi K^{*-}$	$2.932a_2^2$	$2.420a_2^2$
$B^- \to \psi' K^-$	$1.068a_2^2$	$0.559a_2^2$
$B^- \to \psi' K^{*-}$	$1.971a_2^2$	$1.117a_2^2$

$$a_2/a_1 = 0.25 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.06 \tag{52}$$

where we have ignored uncertainties in the theoretical predictions. R_4 is not included in the fit since the model prediction in this case is not thought to be reliable [281]. The second error is due to the uncertainty in the B meson production fractions and lifetimes which enter into the determination of a_1/a_2 in the combination $(f_+\tau_+/f_0\tau_0)$. As this ratio increases, the value of a_2/a_1 decreases. The allowed range of $(f_+\tau_+/f_0\tau_0)$ excludes a negative value of a_2/a_1.

Other uncertainties in the magnitude [282] of f_D, f_{D^*} and in the hadronic form factors can change the magnitude of a_2/a_1 but not its sign. The numerical factors which multiply a_2/a_1 include the ratios of $B \to \pi(B \to \rho)$ to $B \to D$ $(B \to D^*)$ form factors, as well as the ratios of the meson decay constants. We assume values of 220 MeV for f_D and f_{D^*} [283]. To investigate the model dependence of the result we have recalculated $|a_1|$, $|a_2|$, and a_2/a_1 in the model of Deandrea *et al.* We find $|a_1| = 0.97 \pm 0.04 \pm 0.06$, $|a_2| = 0.24 \pm 0.01 \pm 0.01$, and $a_2/a_1 = 0.25 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.05$, consistent with the results discussed above. A different

TABLE XLIX. Ratios of normalization modes to determine the sign of a_2/a_1. The magnitude of a_2/a_1 is the value in the BSW model which agrees with our result for $B \to \psi$ modes.

Ratio	$a_2/a_1 = -0.23$	$a_2/a_1 = 0.23$	Experiment	RI model
R_1	0.51	1.64	1.60 ± 0.30	$1.20 - 1.28$
R_2	0.72	1.33	1.61 ± 0.39	$1.09 - 1.12$
R_3	0.49	1.68	1.85 ± 0.40	$1.19 - 1.27$
R_4	0.68	1.37	2.10 ± 0.61	$1.10 - 1.36$

set of $B \to \pi$ form factors can be calculated using QCD sum rules. Using the form factors determined by Belyaev, Khodjamirian and Rückl [284] and by Ball [285], a_2/a_1 changes by 0.04. Kamal and Pham have also considered the effect of uncertainties in form factors, the effects of final state interactions, and annihilation terms. They conclude that these may change the magnitude of a_2/a_1 but not its sign [286]. Systematic uncertainties in the ratio of D branching fractions could also modify its magnitude.

TABLE L. Predicted (BSW) and measured ratios of widths of D^+ and D^0 modes in charm decay.

Mode	$a_2/a_1 = -0.40$	$a_2/a_1 = 0.40$	Ratio of widths (exp) [25]
$D^+ \to \bar{K}^0\pi^+/D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$	0.26	2.2	0.28 ± 0.05
$D^+ \to \bar{K}^0\rho^+/D^0 \to K^-\rho^+$	0.58	1.5	0.36 ± 0.10
$D^+ \to \bar{K}^{*0}\pi^+/D^0 \to K^{*-}\pi^+$	0.05	3.2	0.17 ± 0.07
$D^+ \to \bar{K}^{*0}\rho^+/D^0 \to K^{*-}\rho^+$	0.34	2.0	0.25 ± 0.12

The magnitude of a_2 determined from this fit to the ratio of B^- and B^0 modes is consistent with the value of a_2 determined from the fit to the $B \to \psi$ decay modes. The sign of a_2 disagrees with the theoretical extrapolation from the fit to charmed meson decays using the BSW model [287]. It is also disagrees with the expectation from the $1/N_c$ rule [273], [288]. Table L compares the corresponding charm decay ratios to the theoretical expectations for positive and negative values of a_2/a_1. The result may be consistent with the expectation of perturbative QCD [289].

C. The Sign of a_2/a_1 and the Anomalous Semileptonic Branching Ratio

A relative plus sign between the coefficients a_1 and a_2 indicating constructive interference in B^- decays came somewhat as a surprise since destructive interference is observed in charm decay. Although constructive interference has been observed in all the B^- modes studied so far these only comprise a small fraction of the total rate. It is therefore important to broaden the experimental base and to measure a_1 and a_2 for a large variety of decay modes. One approach would be to compare inclusive $B^- \to D^0_{\rm direct}$ with $\bar{B}^0 \to D^+_{\rm direct}$ production. It is intriguing that a_1 determined from $B \to D^{(*)}\pi$, $D^{(*)}\rho$ modes agrees well with the value of a_1 extracted from $B \to DD_s$ decays. The observation of color suppressed decays such as $\bar{B}^0 \to D^0\pi^0$ would certainly help to clarify this picture since they give another measure of $|a_2|$ complementary to $B \to$ Charmonium decays .

Keum [292] has suggested that the relative sign of a_1 and a_2 could be determined from a measurement of the polarization in $B^- \to D^{*0}\rho^-$ decays. For $a_2/a_1 > 0$ the amount of longitudinal polarization should be less than 88% and vice versa.

The experimentally measured semileptonic branching ratio is determined to be $(10.35 \pm 0.17 \pm 0.35)\%$ in the model independent dilepton analysis [112]. Comparable but more precise rates are also obtained from the analysis of the single lepton spectrum. These measurements are significantly below the theoretical lower bound $\mathcal{B}_{sl} > 12.5\%$ from QCD calculations within the parton model [121].

It is possible to understand simply the origin of the theoretical limit. In the absence of QCD corrections, the virtual W emitted by the b quark can decay into a lepton-antineutrino pair, a $\bar{u} - d$ quark pair, or $\bar{c} - s$ quark pair. For the decay into a quark pair, there are three possible color states which are equally probable. In addition, corrections must be made for the reduction in phase space in the $W \to \tau\nu$ and $W \to \bar{c}s$ decays. Then the semileptonic fraction, $\mathcal{B}_{SL}$ is given by

$$\mathcal{B}_{SL} = \frac{f_c}{5f_c + 3f_{\bar{c}s} + f_{c\tau}} \tag{53}$$

Using the phase space factors, $f_c = 0.45$, $f_{\bar{c}s} \approx f_{c\tau} = 0.12$ gives $\mathcal{B}_{SL} = 16.5\%$. Including QCD corrections, modifies the hadronic contributions to the width and gives $\mathcal{B}_{SL} = 14.3\%$. The theoretical lower limit of 12.5% is obtained by varying the quark masses and QCD scale to their lower limits.

Several explanations of this discrepancy have been proposed and await experimental confirmation:

- An increased $b \to c\bar{c}s$ component of the B meson hadronic width [121], [218], [122]. However, recent experimental data rule out the mechanism suggested by reference [122] as a major contributor to $B \to$ baryon decays.

- Higher order contributions might reduce the theoretical expectation or the assumption of duality may not hold for b quark decay [125]. The former has been advocated by Bagan, Ball, Braun, and Gosdzinsky who find results consistent with the experimental result [126], [127] but also predict $N_c = 1.28 \pm 0.08$ for the number of charm quarks produced per b decay due to higher order enhancements of the $b \to c\bar{c}s$ channel [127].

- Constructive interference in B^- decays would reduce the theoretical expectation for the semileptonic branching ratio. A small contribution from W exchange to $\bar{B}^0$ decays would keep the lifetime ratio close to unity and satisfy the experimental constraints on this quantity [128].

Increasing the $b \to c\bar{c}s$ component would increase the average number of c quarks produced per b quark decay and lead to another interesting problem: the predicted number of charm quarks per b decay would increase to 1.3 while the current experimental world average for this number is 1.10 ± 0.06 (see section VI D).

There could also be a large contribution to the hadronic width that has not been measured. It has been suggested by Palmer and Stech [218], that $b \to c\bar{c}s$ followed by $c\bar{c} \to$ gluons, which in turn hadronize into a final state with no charm, has a large branching

ratio. Another related suggestion is that the rate for the hadronic penguin diagram $b \to sg$ is much larger than expected [124]. These possibilities will lead to significant production of high multiplicity charmless final states and are difficult to distinguish experimentally.

A systematic study of inclusive hadronic B decays to mesons and baryons will be required to resolve this problem.

XIII. RARE HADRONIC DECAYS

There are hadronic B meson decays that cannot be produced by the usual $b \to c$ transition. The results of the experimental search for these rare decay modes provides important information on the mechanisms of B meson decay and significant progress is being made with the collection of large samples of B mesons by the CLEO II experiment. As an indication of this we will discuss the first observation of radiative penguin decay as well as new experimental results on the decays $\bar{B}^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$ and $\bar{B}^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ where a statistically significant signal has been observed in the sum of the two modes.

Decays of the kind $B \to D_s X_u$, where the X_u system hadronizes as pions, can occur via a $b \to u$ spectator diagram where the W forms a $c\bar{s}$ pair. Since other contributing diagrams are expected to be negligible these decays may provide a clean environment in which to measure V_{ub} in hadronic decays. Decays of the kind $\bar{B}^0 \to D_s^+ X_s^-$, where X_s is a strange meson, are also interesting since they are associated with a W exchange diagram.

FIG. 51. Rare B meson decay diagrams: (a) $b \to u$ spectator and (b) gluonic penguin.

Charmless hadronic decays such as $\bar{B}^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$, $B^- \to \pi^-\pi^0$, $\bar{B}^0 \to \pi^\pm\rho^\mp$ and $B^- \to \pi^0\rho^-$, are expected to be produced by the $b \to u$ spectator diagram (Fig. 51(a)), although there is a possible small contribution from a $b \to d$ penguin diagram (Fig. 51(b)). The decay $\bar{B}^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$ has been discussed as a possible place to observe CP violation in the B meson system [293]. The final state is a CP eigenstate, and CP violation can arise from interference between the amplitude for the direct decay via the $b \to u$ spectator diagram, and the amplitude for the decay following $B^0\bar{B}^0$ mixing. In this decay the CP violating angle is different from the one accessible in $\bar{B}^0 \to \psi K_s$, so the measurement is complementary. There is a possible complication if the $b \to d$ penguin contribution to the amplitude is significant. This could be resolved if measurements are made on other rare hadronic decay modes to determine the role of the penguin amplitude in any observed CP violating effect [293].

Decays to charmless hadronic final states containing an s quark are expected to have a significant contribution from a $b \to s$ penguin diagram, although they can also occur through a CKM suppressed $b \to u$ spectator diagram. The inclusive rates for the hadronic penguin diagrams $b \to sg$ and $b \to sq\bar{q}$ are estimated to be of order 0.1% from the parton model, but predictions for the hadronization into exclusive final states are uncertain because the simple assumptions about factorization of the amplitude used for the spectator diagram may not be valid for loop diagrams.

Gronau, Rosner and London have observed that precise measurements of the branching fractions for hadronic charmless decay modes will provide sufficient information to determine the CKM complex phase [294]. SU(3) symmetry gives the relationship

$$\sqrt{2}A(B^+ \to \pi^0 K^+) + A(B^+ \to \pi^+ K^0) = \tilde{r_u}\sqrt{2}A(B^+ \to \pi^+ \pi^0) \tag{54}$$

where $\tilde{r_u} = f_K/f_\pi |V_{us}/V_{ud}|$ accounts for $SU(3)$ breaking. The weak phase γ enters only in the charmless decay modes proportional to $|V_{ub}|$ but not in those which are proportional to $|V_{ts}|$. By taking appropriate linear combinations of the rates for the above decay modes and their charge conjugates, it is then possible to solve for γ. Of order at least 100 reconstructed decays in each of the modes would be required to complete the determination. However, it has been recently noted that a possible contribution of electroweak penguins to the amplitudes for these decays may invalidate equation (54) [295]. Other systematic uncertainties due to contributions from loops with c and u quarks may also be problematic.

A. Decays to D_s Mesons

These decays have recently been searched for by ARGUS [296] and CLEO II [297]. The upper limits are given in Table LI along with theoretical predictions by Choudury *et al.* [298], and Deandrea *et al.* [280].

The experimental limits are still at least a factor of three above the theoretical predictions. If these limits are compared to the predictions of Deandrea *et al.*then the best constraint on $|V_{ub}/V_{cb}|$ will come from the CLEO II limit on $\bar{B}^0 \to D_s^+ \pi^-$, but that this model dependent limit is still above the range $0.06 < |V_{ub}/V_{cb}| < 0.10$ allowed by the recent semileptonic data [14]. Combining several $D_s X_u$ modes the sensitivity to V_{ub} can be slightly improved. For example, using the BSW model CLEO obtains an upper limit of $|V_{ub}/V_{cb}| < 0.15$ (90% C.L.) [297].

B. Charmless Hadronic B Decay

Predictions of branching ratios for charmless hadronic decays were made by Bauer, Stech and Wirbel [252] using the $b \to u$ spectator diagram and the assumption of factorization. The possible contributions from penguin diagrams were neglected. These predictions have recently been updated by Deandrea *et al.* [280] using new estimates of the hadronic form factors. We compare their results to the experimental upper limits in Table LII. Recently, the LEP experiments with silicon vertex detectors have also contributed to the search for these charmless decay modes. These experiments are also able to set limits on rare decays of the B_s meson (see Table XIII B), which are not produced at threshold experiments.

TABLE LI. Theoretical predictions and experimental upper limits (90% C.L.) for B decays to D_s. All numbers quoted are branching fractions $\times 10^5$

B Decay	Choudury	Deandrea	ARGUS	CLEO II
$D_s^+\pi^-$	1.9	8.1	<170.0	<27.0
$D_s^{*+}\pi^-$	2.7	6.1	<120.0	<44.0
$D_s^+\rho^-$	1.0	1.2	<220.0	<66.0
$D_s^{*+}\rho^-$	5.4	4.5	<250.0	<74.0
$D_s^+\pi^0$	1.8	3.9	<90.0	<20.0
$D_s^{*+}\pi^0$	1.3	3.0	<90.0	<32.0
$D_s^+\eta$		1.1		<46.0
$D_s^{*+}\eta$		0.8		<75.0
$D_s^+\rho^0$	0.5	0.6	<340.0	<37.0
$D_s^{*+}\rho^0$	2.8	2.4	<200.0	<48.0
$D_s^+\omega$		0.6	<340.0	<48.0
$D_s^{*+}\omega$		2.4	<190.0	<68.0
$D_s^+K^-$			<170.0	<23.0
$D_s^{*+}K^-$			<120.0	<17.0
$D_s^+K^{*-}$			<460.0	<97.0
$D_s^{*+}K^{*-}$			<580.0	<110.0

In addition to the results given in Table LII, L3 has set limits on two rare modes with all neutral final states $B^0 \to \eta\pi^0$ and $B \to \eta\eta$ modes of 84×10^{-5} and 210×10^{-5}, respectively.

There are two recent sets of theoretical predictions by Deshpande *et al.* [305] and Chau *et al.* [306] that take into account both penguin and spectator contributions and make predictions for a large number of charmless hadronic B decays. A selection of these predictions are shown in table LIII. Large contributions from the penguin amplitude are expected in decays such as $B \to K^{(*)}\phi$ and $B \to K^{(*)}\pi$. However, the decays $B \to K\rho$ are predicted to have very small penguin amplitudes due to cancellations in the contributions to the amplitude [305].

New upper limits have been presented for $\bar{B}^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$ [35] and $\bar{B}^0 \to \pi^\pm\rho^\mp$ [309]. The CLEO II search for $\bar{B}^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$ is discussed in detail in the next section. CLEO II also has a new limit on $\bar{B}^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ [35], and preliminary results on $\bar{B}^0 \to K^-\rho^+$ [309] as well as the $B \to K^{(*)}\phi$ modes [309]. The CLEO II limits on $\bar{B}^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ and $B^- \to K^-\phi$, which are expected to have a large penguin amplitude, are close to the theoretical predictions.

The experimental sensitivities to branching ratios have now reached the 10^{-5} range. Since the theoretical predictions for several B decay modes are in this range, it is possible that some signals will be observed soon. By measuring a sufficient number of charmless B decay modes (e.g. $\bar{B}^0 \to \pi^-\pi^+$, $B^- \to \pi^-\pi^0$, $\bar{B}^0 \to \pi^0\pi^0$) it may be possible to isolate the spectator and penguin contributions.

TABLE LII. Theoretical predictions and experimental upper limits (90% C.L.) for charmless hadronic B decays. All numbers quoted are branching fractions $\times 10^5$.

B Decay	Deandrea	ARGUS	CLEO 1.5	CLEO II	DELPHI	ALEPH	OPAL
$\pi^+\pi^-$	1.8	<13.0	<7.7	< 2.2	< 5.5	< 7.5	< 4.7
$\pi^\pm\rho^\mp$	5.2	<52.0		< 9.5			
$\rho^+\rho^-$	1.3						
$\pi^\pm a_1^\mp$		<90.0	<49.0				
$\pi^0\pi^0$	0.06			< 1.0			
$\pi^0\rho^0$	0.14	<40.0		< 2.9			
$\rho^0\rho^0$	0.05	<28.0	<29.0				
$\pi^-\pi^0$	1.4	<24.0		< 2.3			
$\pi^-\rho^0$	0.7	<15.0	<17.0	< 4.1	< 26		
$\pi^0\rho^-$	2.7	<55.0					
$\rho^-\rho^0$	0.7	<100.0					
$\pi^-\pi^+\pi^-$					< 22		
$\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-\pi^-$					< 28		

C. New Experimental Results on $\bar{B}^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$ and $\bar{B}^0 \to K^-\pi^+$

The decay modes $\bar{B}^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$, $\bar{B}^0 \to K^-\pi^+$, and $\bar{B}^0 \to K^+K^-$ [310], have been searched for by CLEO II using a data sample of 2.0 fb^{-1} taken on the Υ(4S) [35]. A sample of 0.9 fb^{-1} taken just below the resonance is used to study the continuum background. Since B mesons are produced nearly at rest on the Υ(4S), the final state has two nearly back-to-back tracks with momenta about 2.6 GeV/c. Candidates for B meson decays are distinguished from continuum background using the difference, ΔE, between the total energy of the two tracks and the beam energy, and the beam-constrained mass, M_B. The r.m.s. resolutions on ΔE and M_B are 25 MeV and 2.5 MeV respectively.

Separation between $\pi^-\pi^+$, $K^-\pi^+$ and K^-K^+ events is provided by the ΔE variable, and by dE/dx information from the 51-layer main drift chamber. The ΔE shift between $K\pi$ and $\pi\pi$ events is 42 MeV if E_1 and E_2 are determined using the pion mass. This is $1.7\sigma_{\Delta E}$. The dE/dx separation between kaons and pions at 2.6 GeV/c is found to be $(1.8 \pm 0.1)\sigma$ from a study of a sample of D^{*+}-tagged $D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$ decays. Thus, in the CLEO II experiment the total separation between $K\pi$ and $\pi\pi$ events is 2.5σ.

The background arises entirely from the continuum where the two-jet structure of the events can produce high momentum, back-to-back tracks. These events can be discriminated against by calculating the angle, θ_T, between the thrust axis of the candidate tracks, and the thrust axis of the rest of the event. The distribution of $\cos\theta_T$ is peaked at ± 1 for continuum events, and is nearly flat for $B\bar{B}$ events. A cut is made at $|\cos\theta_T| < 0.7$. Additional discrimination is provided by a Fisher discriminant [311], [312], $\mathcal{F} = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i y_i$. The inputs y_i are the direction of the candidate thrust axis, the B meson flight direction, and nine variables measuring the energy flow of the rest of the event. The coefficients α_i are chosen to maximize the separation between $B\bar{B}$ signal events and continuum background events.

TABLE LIII. Theoretical predictions and experimental upper limits (90% C.L.) for $b \to s$ decays. All numbers quoted are branching fractions $\times 10^5$

B Decay	Deshpande	Chau	ARGUS	CLEO 1.5	CLEO II	DELPHI	ALEPH	OPAL
$K^-\pi^+$	1.1	1.7	<18.0	<7.7	< 1.9	< 9	< 7.5	< 8.1
$K^-\rho^+$	0	0.2			< 4.3			
$K^-{a_1}^+$						< 39		
$K^-\pi^+\pi^-$						< 40		
$K^-\pi^-\pi^+\pi^+$						< 21		
$K^0\pi^0$	0.5	0.6			< 6.3			
$K^0\rho^0$	0.01	0.04	<16.0	<50.0				
$K^{*-}\pi^+$	0.6	1.9	<62.0	<38.0	< 23.8			
$K^{*0}\pi^0$	0.3	0.5			< 3.5			
$K^-\pi^0$	0.6	0.8			< 3.2			
$K^-\rho^0$	0.01	0.06	<18.0	<8.0	< 2.6	< 19		
$K^0\pi^-$	1.1	1.2	<9.6	<10.0	< 6.8			
$K^0\rho^-$	0	0.03						
$K^{*0}\pi^-$	0.6	0.9	<17.0	<15.0	< 6.0			
$K^{*-}\pi^0$	0.3	0.9						
$K^0\phi$	1.1	0.9	<36.0	<42.0	< 10.7			
$K^{*0}\phi$	3.1	0.9	<32.0	<38.0	< 3.9			
$K^-\phi$	1.1	1.4	<18.0	<9.0	< 1.4	< 44		
$K^{*-}\phi$	3.1	0.8	<130.0		< 9.0			
$\phi\phi$					< 4.8			
$K^-K^+K^-$						< 31		

The optimal cut on the Fischer discriminant is 84% efficient for signal and 40% efficient for background.

Two approaches are used to evaluate the amount of signal in the data sample. In the first approach a cut is made on $\mathcal{F}$ and events are classified as $\pi\pi$, $K\pi$ or KK according to the most probable hypothesis from the dE/dx information. The signal and background numbers are given in Table XIII.C. The efficiency for the correct identification of a signal event in this analysis is 19%. The background is estimated using sidebands in the continuum and on-resonance data and scaling factors from Monte Carlo studies. There is no $B\bar{B}$ background in the signal region.

To increase the efficiency of the search and to exploit the information contained in the distributions of the ΔE, M_B, $\mathcal{F}$ and dE/dx variables a second analysis is performed. The cuts described above are removed, and an unbinned maximum-likelihood fit is made. In this fit the signal and background distributions are defined by probability density functions derived from Monte Carlo studies. The fit determines the relative contributions of $\pi^-\pi^+$, $K^-\pi^+$ and K^-K^+ to the signal and background. The best fit values for the signal yields $N_{\pi\pi}$, $N_{K\pi}$ and N_{KK}, are given in Table XIII.C. Fig. 52 shows the $n\sigma$ contours in the plane $N_{\pi\pi}$ *vs.* $N_{K\pi}$, and Fig. 53 shows the projections of the likelihood fit onto the M_B and ΔE axes compared to the events observed. The efficiency for a signal event to be included in the likelihood analysis is 38%.

FIG. 52. Likelihood contours in the CLEO II analysis for the fit to $N_{\pi\pi}$ and $N_{K\pi}$. The best fit is indicated by the cross, the 1, 2, 3, and 4σ contours by solid lines, and the 1.28σ contour by the dotted line.

FIG. 53. CLEO II results on $B \to \pi^+\pi^-$ and $K^+\pi^-$. Comparison of on-resonance data (histogram) with projections of the likelihood fit (solid curve). (a) Projection onto M_B after cuts on ΔE and $\mathcal{F}$ (b) Projection onto ΔE after cuts on M_B and $\mathcal{F}$. The shaded portions of the histogram are $\pi\pi$ events, the unshaded are $K\pi$ events. The dotted and dot-dashed lines in (b) indicate the fit projections for $K\pi$ and $\pi\pi$ separately.

The best fit value shown in Fig. 52 is more than 4σ away from the point $N_{\pi\pi} = N_{K\pi} = 0$. After including the effect of systematic errors on the sum of $N_{\pi\pi}$ and $N_{K\pi}$ [311], it has been

TABLE LIV. Upper limits on branching fractions for rare B_s decay modes in unit of 10^{-5}.

$\bar{B}_s$ Mode	ALEPH	OPAL	DELPHI
$\bar{B}_s \to \pi^+\pi^-$	< 25		
$\bar{B}_s \to K^+\pi^-$	< 25	< 26	< 9
$\bar{B}_s \to K^+K^-$	< 11	< 14	< 12
$\bar{B}_s \to p\bar{p}$	< 11		

TABLE LV. Updated results for the branching fractions of $B^0 \to K^+\pi^-$, $B^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$, and $B^0 \to K^+K^-$. Upper limits are at the 90% confidence level.

Mode	Event Yield	$\mathcal{B}$ (10^{-5})	Theoretical Predictions (10^{-5})
$\pi^+\pi^-$	$8.5^{+4.9}_{-4.0}$	< 2.2	1.0-2.6
$K^+\pi^-$	$7.1^{+4.2}_{-3.4}$	< 1.9	1.0-2.0
K^+K^-	$0.0^{+1.6}_{-0.0}$	< 0.7	–
$\pi^+\pi^- + K^+\pi^-$	$15.7^{+5.3}_{-4.5}$	$1.8^{+0.6}_{-0.5} \pm 0.2$	

concluded that the significance of the sum is sufficient to claim the observation of a signal for charmless hadronic B decays. It should be emphasized that the present data do not have sufficient statistical precision to allow any conclusion to be reached about the relative importance of the two decays. While the CLEO II experiment does not measure signals for the individual decays $\bar{B}^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$ and $\bar{B}^0 \to K^-\pi^+$, it does set stringent upper limits (Table XIII C).

Studies have been made of the amount of additional data that might be required to measure signals in the individual modes, and it is estimated that a sample of about 4 fb^{-1} may be sufficient, assuming that the best fit continues to give the same yields for $N_{\pi\pi}$ and $N_{K\pi}$. Note that the separation between $\pi\pi$ and $K\pi$ provided by ΔE and dE/dx is adequate for this analysis, as can be seen from the nearly circular form of the contours in Fig. 52.

D. Inclusive/Semi-Inclusive $b \to sg$ transitions

It is major experimental challenge to measure the rate for the inclusive process $b \to s$ gluon, where the virtual gluon hadronizes into a $q\bar{q}$ pair. At least two methods have been proposed to determine the rate for such inclusive transitions. Since the coupling of gluons to quark-antiquark pairs is flavor independent, it is expected that except for modifications due to phase space $b \to s\bar{s}s$ will be comparable to $b \to s\bar{u}u$, $b \to s\bar{d}d$. Experimentally, one searches for inclusive $B \to \phi$ transitions with the ϕ momentum in the range beyond the kinematic limit for $b \to c$ transitions, or $B \to \phi X_s$ where the X_s system contains a kaon

and additional pions. For example, Deshpande and He find $\mathcal{B}(B \to X_s\phi) = (0.6-2)\times 10^{-4}$ [353], [352]. Alternately, one may attempt to reconstruct $B \to K^-$ with additional pions.

Several authors have proposed that $b \to sg$ transitions are enhanced in order to explain the anomalously low value of the B semileptonic branching fraction. In addition, it is conceivable that new physics could modify $b \to sg$ without significantly modifying the rates for $b \to s\gamma$ or $b \to sl^+l^-$.

XIV. ELECTROMAGNETIC PENGUIN DECAYS

A. Observation of $B \to K^*(892)\gamma$

The first observation of the electromagnetic decay $B \to K^*\gamma$ has been reported by CLEO II [15]. A data sample of 1.38 fb^{-1} taken on the Υ(4S) resonance was searched for both $\bar{B}^0 \to \bar{K}^{*0}\gamma$ and $B^- \to K^{*-}\gamma$, where the $\bar{K}^{*0}$ was detected in its $K^-\pi^+$ decay mode, and the K^{*-} in both the $K^-\pi^0$ and $K_s\pi^-$ decay modes. If a K^* candidate is within 75 MeV of the known K^* mass then it is combined with an isolated photon with an energy between 2.1 and 2.9 GeV. The photon candidate must not be matched to a charged track, and must have a shower shape consistent with an isolated photon. If the photon candidate forms a $\pi^0(\eta)$ meson when combined with any another photon with energy greater than 30(200) MeV it is rejected.

Candidates for B meson decays are identified using the variables $\Delta E = E_{K^*} + E_\gamma - E_{beam}$ and M_B. The r.m.s. resolutions on ΔE and M_B are 40 MeV and 2.8 MeV respectively.

TABLE LVI. Summary of results for $B \to K^*\gamma$

	$\bar{B}^0 \to K^{*0}\gamma$	$B^- \to K^{*-}\gamma$	
	$\bar{K}^{*0} \to K^-\pi^+$	$K^{*-} \to K_s\pi^-$	$K^{*-} \to K^-\pi^0$
Signal Events	8	2	3
Continuum Background	1.1±0.2	0.05±0.03	0.8±0.3
$B\bar{B}$ Background	0.30±0.15	0.01±0.01	0.10±0.05
Detection Efficiency	(11.9±1.8)%	(2.0±0.3)%	(3.1±0.5)%
Branching Ratio	$(4.0\pm1.7\pm0.8)\times10^{-5}$	$(5.7\pm3.1\pm1.1)\times10^{-5}$	

There are two main sources of background from the continuum, $q\bar{q}$ jets and initial state radiation (ISR). These backgrounds are suppressed by applying cuts on the shape variables $R_2 < 0.5$, $|\cos\theta_T| < 0.7$, and $0.25 < s_\perp < 0.60$. The upper restriction on $s_\perp$ is useful for rejecting ISR background. By transforming the event into the frame where the photon is at rest, and defining new shape variables $R_2^{'}$ and $\cos\theta_T^{'}$ in this frame, the ISR background can be further suppressed. There is a small amount of background to $B \to K^*\gamma$ from other $B\bar{B}$ events. The size of this background was determined from a high statistics Monte Carlo study. This study includes a feeddown from other $b \to s\gamma$ decays, which was estimated using the theoretical models for $b \to s\gamma$ discussed in the next section. The remaining background is mainly due to continuum e^+e^- annihilation. This contribution has been determined using

ΔE, M_B sidebands in both the $\Upsilon(4S)$ and continuum data and scaling factors determined from Monte Carlo studies.

FIG. 54. The beam-constrained mass distribution from CLEO II for $B \to K^*\gamma$ candidates; $K^-\pi^+\gamma$ solid, $K^-\pi^0\gamma$ shaded, $K_S\pi^-\gamma$ unshaded

Supporting evidence that the events in the signal region are due to the decay $B \to K^*\gamma$ comes from a likelihood analysis similar to the one described in section XIII C. In this analysis the distributions of the events in the variables M_B, ΔE, M_{K^*}, $\cos\Theta_{K^*}$ (the K^* helicity angle), $\cos\theta_B$, R_2, R_2', $s_\perp$, and $\cos\theta_T'$ are compared to the distributions expected from Monte Carlo samples of signal and continuum background events [316]. This analysis gives results completely consistent with the signal and background yields given in Table LVI.

The eight $K^{*0}\gamma$ and five $K^{*-}\gamma$ events in the signal region, $|\Delta E| < 90$ MeV and $5.274 \leq M_B < 5.286$ GeV, are a clear signal for the decay $B \to K^*\gamma$ (Fig. 54). The yields in the observed modes are consistent. Assuming that $B^0 \to K^{*0}\gamma$ and $B^- \to K^{*-}\gamma$ are equal, the average branching ratio is $(4.5 \pm 1.5 \pm 0.9) \times 10^{-5}$. This is in agreement with theoretical predictions from the electromagnetic penguin diagram [318].

B. Search for exclusive $b \to d\gamma$ transitions

CLEO has also searched for exclusive $b \to d\gamma$ decay modes including $\bar{B}^0 \to \rho^0\gamma$, $B^- \to \rho^-\gamma$ and $B \to \omega\gamma$ [317]. In these modes, the largest background arises from continuum production with significant contributions from the $b \to s\gamma$ process $B \to K^*\gamma$, $K^* \to K^-\pi^+$ with the charged kaon misidentified as a pion. Some discrimination between $B \to K^{*0}\gamma$ and $B \to \rho^0\gamma$ is provided by ΔE, the vector decay angle, and by the constraint that $\pi\pi$ mass lie in the ρ mass region. This information is used by a neural network to reduce the background from $B \to K^*\gamma$ by a factor of 20 while retaining 50% of the $B \to \rho\gamma$ signal. No signals are observed and upper limits at the 90% C.L. of $\mathcal{B}(B^- \to \rho^-\gamma) < 2.0 \times 10^{-5}$, $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to \rho^0\gamma) < 2.4 \times 10^{-5}$, and $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to \omega\gamma) < 1.1 \times 10^{-5}$ are obtained.

FIG. 56. (a) The on-resonance data is shown as the solid histogram, the scaled off resonance data is the dashed histogram, and the sum of off-resonance data and background from $b \to c$ and $b \to u$ decays are the squares with error bars. (b) The photon energy distribution for $b \to s\gamma$ from CLEO II for the event shape analysis after subtraction of all backgrounds. The points with error bars are the background subtracted data while the solid curve is the Monte Carlo prediction for the shape of the $b \to s\gamma$ signal.

C. Experimental Constraints on the $b \to s\gamma$ Inclusive Rate

FIG. 55. (a) The on-resonance data is shown as the solid histogram, the scaled off resonance data is the dashed histogram, and the sum of off-resonance data and background from $b \to c$ and $b \to u$ decays are the squares with error bars. (b) The photon energy distribution for $b \to s\gamma$ from CLEO II for the event shape analysis after subtraction of all backgrounds. The points with error bars are the background subtracted data while the solid curve is the Monte Carlo prediction for the shape of the $b \to s\gamma$ signal.

At present, due to the uncertainties in the hadronization, only the inclusive $b \to s\gamma$ rate can be reliably compared with theoretical calculations. This rate can be measured from the CLEO II for the B reconstruction analysis after subtraction of all backgrounds. The signal for $b \to s\gamma$ is expected endpoint of the inclusive photon spectrum in B decay. to peak in the region $2.2 < E_\gamma < 2.7$ GeV, with only about 15% of the rate expected to lie outside this range [318].

Two experimental methods are employed to suppress the large background from non-resonant $e^+e^- \to q\bar{q}$ and initial state radiation i.e. $e^+e^- \to q\bar{q}\gamma$.

One method uses partial reconstruction of the decay products of the kaonic resonance which recoils against the energetic photon. This is referred to as the B reconstruction analysis. A kaon candidate (either charged or neutral), up to four charged tracks, and two or fewer π^0s are combined with the photon candidate and are required to be consistent with the B mass. The resulting photon spectrum after event shape cuts is examined. This technique does not require that the final state kaonic resonance be correctly reconstructed and is primarily designed to suppress the continuum background.

A complementary method using a neural network is also used to distinguish $b \to s\gamma$ signal and background. This is referred to as the event shape analysis. The network uses the event shape variables R_2, $S_\perp$, R_2', $\cos\theta_T'$ as well as the energy deposited in cones within 20° and 30° of the photon direction and in similiar cones in the direction opposite to the photon. The output of the neural network is a value between -1 and 1 which measures the degree to which an event resembles signal. The network is trained using a large sample

of continuum Monte Carlo events. There is good agreement between the network output from Monte Carlo simulations and various data samples (e.g. continuum data, $B \to X\mu\nu$ candidates).

The experimental photon energy spectra from the two methods are shown in Figs. 55, 56. In the CLEO II data there is an excess of $2.2 < E_\gamma < 2.7$ GeV in the B reconstruction analysis and an excess of 263 ± 104 events from B decays in this region for the event shape analysis [313]. The detection efficiencies are 9% and 32% respectively. However, the signal to noise ratio in the B reconstruction analysis is a factor of 4 higher so the sensitivities are comparable. These correspond to branching ratios of $(1.88 \pm 0.74) \times 10^{-4}$ for the B reconstruction analysis and $(2.75 \pm 0.67) \times 10^{-4}$ for the event shape analysis. The errors quoted are statistical only. The two results are consistent at the 1.1 standard deviation level. The model dependence introduced when extrapolating from the partial branching fraction in the signal window to the branching fraction for the entire range of photon energies is evaluated using a parton model calculation. The largest uncertainty arises from the error in m_b, the b quark mass. This parameter is allowed to vary in the range $m_b = 4.87 \pm 0.10$. The resulting (10%) change in the branching ratio is incorporated in the systematic error. The results of the two analyses can be combined allowing for statistical correlations and separating the correlated and independent components of the systematic error to give,

$$\mathcal{B}(b \to s\gamma) = (2.32 \pm 0.57 \pm 0.35) \times 10^{-4}$$

where the first error is statistical and the second is systematic.

For the purposes of constraining extensions of the Standard Model, it is useful to derive upper and lower limits at the 95% confidence level from this measurement. This gives:

$$1.0 \times 10^{-4} < \mathcal{B}(b \to s\gamma) < 4.2 \times 10^{-4} \text{ (at the 95\% c.l.)}$$

An alternative approach to measuring the inclusive rate is to use the observed exclusive rate for $B \to K^*\gamma$. However, the fraction of the inclusive rate that hadronizes to a particular exclusive final state is not very well understood. Ali *et al.* [318] predict the mass distribution of the X_s system using an estimate of the Fermi momentum of the spectator quark ($p_F = 300$ MeV). By integrating this spectrum up to 1 GeV and assuming this region is dominated by the K^* resonance, the fraction of $K^*(892)\gamma$ is estimated to be (13±3)%. Other authors have made predictions between 5% and 40% for the fraction of $K^*(892)\gamma$ [323]. A reasonable estimate that covers most of the theoretical predictions is (13±6)%. Examination of the observed mass of the (X_s system) particles which accompany the high energy photon in $b \to s\gamma$ indicates that there are states other than $B \to K^*\gamma$ which contribute. Note that the apparent X_s mass spectrum shown in Fig. 57 is not corrected for efficiency which decreases rapidly as a function of mass nor for misreconstruction of high multiplicity channels.

FIG. 57. Apparent X_s invariant mass spectrum for $b \to s\gamma$ candidates after background subtraction.

Searches have also been made for $b \to s\gamma$ processes at LEP. The L3 experiment has set an upper limit of 1.2×10^{-3} (90% C.L.) on the inclusive $b \to s\gamma$ rate [321]. The exclusive decays $B^0 \to K^{*0}\gamma$ and $B_s \to \phi\gamma$ have been searched for by the DELPHI experiment using the particle identification capabilities of the RICH detector. Upper limits of 5.6×10^{-4} and 19.0×10^{-4} are obtained for these two decays [322]. ALEPH has searched for $B_s \to \phi\gamma$ and $\Lambda_b \to \Lambda\gamma$ and obtains limits of 29×10^{-5} and 56×10^{-5} respectively.

D. Theoretical Implications of $b \to s\gamma$

There has been recent interest in $b \to s\gamma$ as a probe of physics beyond the standard model [329], [16,330]. There are possible additional contributions to the loop from a charged Higgs

boson and from supersymmetric particles. Hewett [16] has considered two Higgs doublet models and shown that contributions comparable to the standard model are expected for a charged Higgs mass of order 100 GeV. In supersymmetric models there are also contributions from loops containing charginos, neutralinos and squarks that tend to cancel the charged Higgs and standard model contributions (in unbroken supersymmetry all contributions to the loop diagram cancel exactly) [328]. Several recent papers [330] investigate the parameter space allowed by $b \to s\gamma$ for particular models of the breaking of the supersymmetry. For most of the parameter space the charged Higgs contribution is the dominant one, and the present CLEO II upper limit on $b \to s\gamma$ constrains the charged Higgs mass to be greater than 244 GeV. This is more restrictive than constraints from direct searches at existing high energy colliders. The limit on the charged Higgs mass can be avoided in some supersymmetric models if the stop mass is small since this leads to a large negative contribution from the chargino-stop loop. For this case the rate for $b \to s\gamma$ could even become smaller than the standard model prediction.

Other constraints on new physics have been derived from the bounds on $b \to s\gamma$. If there are anomalous $W - W - \gamma$ couplings, these can significantly modify the rate for $b \to s\gamma$. The CLEO measurements exclude certain regions of the parameter space of anomalous dipole and quadrupole couplings of the W boson that cannot be explored by direct studies of $W^+ - \gamma$ production at hadron colliders [332]. It has also been suggested that these results constrain most supersymmetric dark matter candidates to such an extent that they will not produce significant counting rates in dedicated dark matter WIMP searches planned in the near future [333].

E. $b \to s\ell^+\ell^-$ Decays

The $b \to s\gamma$ diagram can be modified by replacing the real photon by a virtual photon or by a virtual Z^0 or other neutral boson that produces a lepton pair (see Fig. 58). This penguin diagram leads to both $B \to K\ell^+\ell^-$ and $B \to K^*\ell^+\ell^-$ decays, since the $B \to K$ transition is no longer forbidden by angular momentum conservation as it was for $b \to s\gamma$. Although the penguin amplitude for $b \to s\ell^+\ell^-$ is smaller than $b \to s\gamma$ the final states can be identified easily, and are particularly favorable for study at hadron colliders. As in the radiative penguin decay discussed previously, the process $b \to s\ell^+\ell^-$ is sensitive to high mass physics including charged Higgs bosons and non-standard neutral particles. These modes also do not have significant QCD corrections which may be a useful feature when constraining new physics. Ali, Mannel, and Guidice have noted that the constraints imposed by the combinations of measurements of $b \to s\gamma$ and $b \to s\ell^+\ell^-$ can severely constrain new physics including SUSY models [357].

The penguin amplitude has been calculated by a number of authors [334], with results for the inclusive $b \to se^+e^-$ rate of $(1-2) \times 10^{-5}$ and for the $b \to s\mu^+\mu^-$ rate of $(4-8) \times 10^{-6}$. The exclusive channels $K^*\ell^+\ell^-$ and $K\ell^+\ell^-$ are expected to comprise $5-30\%$ of the inclusive rate. However, the theoretical description of $b \to s\ell^+\ell^-$ is more complicated than $b \to s\gamma$, since the final states $K^{(*)}\ell^+\ell^-$ can also be produced via "long distance" contributions from the hadronic decay $B \to K^{(*)}\psi$ followed by $\psi \to \ell^+\ell^-$ where ψ stands for a real or virtual charmonium state [335]. Ali, Mannel and Morozumi [336] have performed an analysis of

FIG. 58. Diagrams for the decays $B \to K^{(*)}\ell^+\ell^-$.

$b \to s\ell^+\ell^-$ including both the penguin and the long distance contributions. Their predictions for the inclusive $b \to s\ell^+\ell^-$ rate are in the range $(2-6)\times 10^{-6}$ excluding the regions close to the ψ and ψ' mass where the long distance contributions dominate. There is interference between the penguin and long distance amplitudes over a wide range of dilepton masses. Ali *et al.* point out that the sign of the interference is controversial, and that information about the interference can be obtained both from the dilepton mass distribution, and from the forward-backward asymmetry of the lepton pair.

The $B \to K^* e^+ e^-$ mode has significant contributions from both virtual Z^0s and virtual photons. At low m^2, the virtual photon contribution is dominant and has a pole. This must be properly taken into account when computing experimental efficiency, since there is usually a cut on $m^2_{e^+e^-}$ to eliminate conversions [337].

Experimental searches have been made by CLEO 1.5, CLEO II and ARGUS at the $\Upsilon(4S)$, and by UA1 and CDF in $p\bar{p}$ collisions. The CLEO and ARGUS analyses [338–340] make a simple veto on dilepton masses consistent with a real ψ or ψ', and see almost no background in their beam-constrained mass plots. CDF has searched for $B^+ \to K^+\mu^+\mu^-$ and $B^0 \to K^{*0}\mu^+\mu^-$ using the mode $B \to \psi K^+$ for normalization [342]. The CDF analysis requires that the dilepton mass lie in the range $3.3-3.6$ GeV or in the range $3.8-4.5$ GeV. This avoids contamination from modes with ψ and $\psi^{'}$ mesons and reduces the combinatorial background. The UA1 analysis [341] selects a range $3.9 < M(\ell^+\ell^-) < 4.4$ GeV which is believed to have small long distance contributions and no radiative tail from the ψ. UA1 performs both an exclusive search for $\bar{B}^0 \to \bar{K}^{*0}\mu^+\mu^-$ and an inclusive search for $B \to X_s\mu^+\mu^-$. The upper limits derived from the hadron collider searches using a small fraction of the allowed dilepton mass range e.g. for example the CDF search considers about 25%. The limits on the partial branching fraction are extrapolated to the full dilepton mass range using a theoretical model. The upper limits from all the experimental measurements are summarized in Table LVII. These upper limits are all well above the theoretical predictions The CLEO II limit on $\bar{B}^0 \to K^{*0}e^+e^-$ is within a factor of 3 of the branching ratio predicted by the Standard Model. These limits suggest that $b \to s\ell^+\ell^-$ decays will eventually be observed at either hadron colliders, or by $\Upsilon(4S)$ experiments.

XV. PURELY LEPTONIC B DECAY

TABLE LVII. Experimental upper limits (90% C.L.) for $b \to s\ell^+\ell^-$ decays. All numbers quoted are branching fractions $\times 10^{-5}$

B Decay	ARGUS	CLEO I	CLEO 1.5	CLEO II	UA1	CDF
$K^0 e^+e^-$	<15.0	<56.0				
$K^- e^+e^-$	<9.0	<24.0	<5.7	< 1.2		
$K^0 \mu^+\mu^-$	<26.0	<39.0				
$K^- \mu^+\mu^-$	<22.0	<36.0	<17.0	< 0.9		< 3.5
$\bar{K}^{*0} e^+e^-$	<29.0		<6.9	< 1.6		
$K^{*-} e^+e^-$	<63.0					
$\bar{K}^{*0} \mu^+\mu^-$	<34.0		<16.0	< 3.1	<2.3	< 5.1
$K^{*-} \mu^+\mu^-$	<110.0					
$X_s \mu^+\mu^-$					<5.0	

A. B Decays to Two Leptons

The Standard Model allows B^0 and B_s mesons to decay to e^+e^- $\mu^+\mu^-$ or $\tau^+\tau^-$ via box diagrams or loop diagrams involving both W and Z propagators (see Fig. 59) [343]. The largest branching fraction is predicted to be 4×10^{-7} for $B_s \to \tau^+\tau^-$, and the smallest 2×10^{-15} for $B^0 \to e^+e^-$. The decays to the lighter leptons are suppressed by a helicity factor which is proportional to m_ℓ^2, and the B^0 decays are suppressed relative to the B_s decays by the factor $|V_{td}/V_{ts}|^2$. Decays to the final states $e^\pm\mu^\mp$, $e^\pm\tau^\mp$ and $\mu^\pm\tau^\mp$ are all forbidden in the Standard Model by lepton family number conservation.

A search for B^0 decays to two leptons has been made by CLEO II [344], and there are also searches for $B^0 \to \mu^+\mu^-$ by the UA1 and CDF collaborations at hadron colliders [341,345]. The 90% C.L. upper limits on the allowed processes are 5.9×10^{-6} for $B^0 \to e^+e^-$ (CLEO II), and 3.2×10^{-6} (CDF), 5.9×10^{-6} (CLEO II) and 8.3×10^{-6} (UA1) for $B^0 \to \mu^+\mu^-$. The hadron collider experiments will set similar limits on $B_s \to \mu^+\mu^-$, and presumably have not done so because the B_s mass was unknown until recently (see section III D) .

FIG. 59. Diagrams for the dilepton decays of B mesons.

CLEO II also sets limits on the lepton-flavor changing decays of 5.9×10^{-6} for $B^0 \to e^\pm\mu^\mp$, 7.9×10^{-4} for $B^0 \to e^\pm\tau^\mp$ and 1.2×10^{-3} for $B^0 \to \mu^\pm\tau^\mp$. Upper limits on the lepton flavor violating decays $B^- \to K^- e^\pm\mu^\mp$ and $\bar{B}^0 \to \bar{K}^{*0} e^\pm\mu^\mp$ of $< 1.2 \times 10^{-5}$ and 2.7×10^{-5} have also been set.

Several recent papers consider the relative sensitivity of various lepton-flavor changing decays to non-Standard Model couplings [346], [347] . Sher and Yuan argue that larger Yukawa couplings are expected for third generation quarks, and that these larger couplings not only enhance the sensitivity of the decays, but also make them less dependent on the detailed parameterization of the new couplings [346]. They make a comparison of B and K decays which suggests that $B_s \to \tau\mu$ has the best sensitivity, although it is unclear how to search for this channel experimentally. The more accessible channel $B_s \to \mu e$ could also have better sensitivity than the equivalent decay $K_L \to \mu e$, even though the upper limit on the latter is now in the 10^{-11} range. B^0 decays are less sensitive than B_s decays but are still of interest because they can be searched for in experiments at the $\Upsilon(4S)$.

B. The Decays $B \to \tau\nu$, $B \to \mu\nu$ and $B \to e\nu$.

The decay $B^+ \to \tau^+\nu$ proceeds through the annihilation of the constituent quarks in analogy to the $\pi^+ \to \mu^+\nu$ decay. The branching fraction is given by:

$$\mathcal{B}(B^+ \to \tau^+\nu) = \frac{G_F^2 m_B m_\tau^2}{8\pi}\left(1 - \frac{m_\tau^2}{m_B^2}\right) f_B^2 |V_{ub}|^2 \tau_B$$

All the parameters in this equation are well known except the decay constant f_B and the CKM matrix element V_{ub}. Given a more accurate knowledge of V_{ub} from other measurements and the experimental observation of the decay $B^+ \to \tau^+\nu$, it would be possible to determine a value for f_B. The measurement of this decay constant is of fundamental importance for B physics since it enters into many other B decay measurements, including most notably $B\bar{B}$ mixing [348].

The present theoretical estimates of f_B from lattice QCD and QCD sum rules are in the range $f_B = (180 \pm 50)$ MeV [349]. Using this value of f_B and our standard values of V_{ub} and τ_B, we obtain a prediction of $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \to \tau^+\nu) = 4.0 \times 10^{-5}$. The decays $B^+ \to \mu^+\nu$ and $B^+ \to e^+\nu$ have smaller branching ratios of 1.4×10^{-7} and 3.3×10^{-12} respectively. The decays to the muon and electron are suppressed relative to the tau decay by a helicity factor proportional to the square of the lepton mass. The radiative decays $B^+ \to \mu\nu\gamma$ and $B^+ \to e\nu\gamma$ are less suppressed and occur at rates comparable to their purely leptonic counterparts [351].

CLEO II has searched for $B^+ \to \tau^+\nu$ followed by $\tau \to l\nu\bar{\nu}$. In this case, the observed showers and tracks, apart from the lepton, must originate from the other B meson. No additional leptons are allowed. Constraints on the missing energy and momentum are used to isolate the signal. No significant excess is found. This leads to a 90% C.L. upper limit of $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \to \tau^+\nu) < 2.2 \times 10^{-3}$ [350]. Using the same technique as in their analysis of the mode $B \to \tau\nu X$ (see section IV A 4), but requiring additional missing energy, ALEPH finds $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \to \tau^+\nu) < 1.8 \times 10^{-3}$ [137].

CLEO II has also searched for $B^+ \to \mu^+\nu$ as well as $B^+ \to e^+\nu$. The B meson decays almost at rest into a μ^+ (or e^+) and a neutrino which are back-to-back and have energies of about 2.65 GeV. The muon is well identified and has little background. The neutrino is "detected" by calculating the missing momentum p_{miss} of the whole event. If all the decay products of the other B^- have been measured by the CLEO II detector p_{miss} will be a good

estimator of the neutrino momentum. Then the analysis proceeds as if this were a fully reconstructed B decay, with the calculation of the energy difference, ΔE, and the beam-constrained mass, M_B. The analysis is almost background free, and gives a 90% C.L. upper limit of $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \to \mu^+\nu) < 2.1 \times 10^{-5}$. The sensitivity in the electron mode is comparable, $\mathcal{B}(B^+ \to\ e^+\nu) < 1.5 \times 10^{-5}$ [350].

The limits on $B^+ \to \tau^+\nu$ and $B^+ \to \mu^+\nu$ are both two orders of magnitude above the theoretical predictions, corresponding to the rather uninteresting limit on f_B of about 2.6 GeV for $|V_{ub}/V_{cb}| = 0.073$.

XVI. CONSTRAINTS ON THE CKM MATRIX

A. Introduction

One of the primary goals of the B physics program is the determination of the values of V, the CKM (Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa) couplings. The experimental results were discussed in previous sections. We now summarize their implications for the CKM matrix.

The usual form of the CKM matrix is given below.

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\ V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\ V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix} \tag{55}$$

The matrix V can be expressed approximately as

$$V \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1-\lambda^2/2 & \lambda & A\lambda^3(\rho - i\eta) \\ -\lambda & 1-\lambda^2/2 & A\lambda^2 \\ A\lambda^3(1-\rho-i\eta) & -A\lambda^2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + O(\lambda^4) \tag{56}$$

This empirical parameterization, suggested by Wolfenstein, is correct to terms of order λ^4 with $\lambda = \sin\theta_{Cabibbo} \approx 0.22$ [2]. As noted by Buras, Lautenbacher, and Ostermaier, in the future as the precision of measurements improves, the above approximation will have to be extended to be correct up to order λ^6 [354]. This can be accomplished by adding the correction

$$\Delta V \simeq \begin{pmatrix} -\lambda^4/8 & 0 & 0 \\ A^2\lambda^5(\frac{1}{2} - \rho - i\eta) & -(\frac{A^2}{2} + 1/8)\lambda^4 & 0 \\ \frac{A^2}{2}\lambda^5(\rho + i\eta) & A\lambda^4(\frac{1}{2} - \rho - i\eta) & -A^2/\lambda^6 \end{pmatrix} + O(\lambda^6) \tag{57}$$

B. The CKM element $|V_{cb}|$

The value of V_{cb}, the fundamental weak interaction coupling constant, may be determined from the semileptonic width:

$$\Gamma(b \to cl\nu) = \gamma_c^2 |V_{cb}|^2$$

FIG. 60. Representation of the Bjorken or Unitarity triangle in the complex plane.

where γ_c is a constant determined from theory e.g. quark model calculations. The semileptonic width is obtained from measurements of the semileptonic branching fraction and the appropriate average of the charged and neutral B meson lifetimes, ($< \tau_B >$)

$$\Gamma(b \to cl\nu) = \frac{\mathcal{B}(b \to cl\nu)}{< \tau_B >}.$$

The width has a m_b^5 dependence on the b quark mass although Shifman *et al.* argue that in a certain limit, the dependence is much weaker and is proportional to $m_b - m_c$ [152], [150]. Their calculation and the world average for the semileptonic branching fraction give,

$$|V_{cb}|_{\text{Inclusive}} = 0.03965 \pm 0.001(\text{exp}) \pm 0.002(\text{theo})$$

where the first error is experimental and the second is the quoted theoretical uncertainty. The theoretical uncertainty in the determination of $|V_{cb}|$ from inclusive semileptonic decays is currently a matter of active discussion and no clear consensus has emerged [147].

Two other methods are used to determine the value of $|V_{cb}|$. These are measurements of the total widths of exclusive final states from branching fractions and measurement of the $B \to D^* \ell\nu$ rate at zero recoil. The former method of obtaining $|V_{cb}|$ from the total rate has the distinct advantage that the models used make other detailed predictions for form factors and various other observables which can be experimentally verified. In addition, all of the data can be used unlike the HQET inspired method which is valid only near zero recoil. Using the world average of the branching fraction for $\bar{B} \to D^* \ell\nu$ and the ISGW' model to obtain the central values, we find

$$|V_{cb}|_{\text{Exclusive}} = 0.0347 \pm 0.0016(\text{exp}) \pm 0.0024(\text{theo})$$

For the HQET method, which requires experimental measurements of the differential spectrum of $\bar{B} \to D^* \ell\nu$ decays, there are two significant uncertainties in the final determination of $|V_{cb}|$ from measurements of the spectrum at zero recoil. These arise from the model dependence in the calculation of the $1/m_c^2$ corrections to $\xi(1)$ and the lack of knowledge of the functional form of the function $\xi(y)$ which is used for the extrapolation. Using the value of $\xi(1)$ recently calculated by Neubert [148] and the world average for the experimental intercept gives

$$|V_{cb}|_{\text{HQET}} = 0.0386 \pm 0.0024(\text{exp}) \pm 0.0012(\text{theory}) \tag{58}$$

where the first error is experimental and the second is the theoretical uncertainty in $\xi(1)$. The model dependence from the theoretical uncertainty in the normalization is about 4% but may be reduced in the near future.

A precise determination of $|V_{cb}|$ constrains the product $A\lambda^2$, following the notation of Wolfenstein. Since λ is well determined from measurements of kaon decays, the parameter A is determined from $|V_{cb}|$. Using $\lambda = 0.2205 \pm 0.0018$, the world average computed by the PDG group, and the value of $|V_{cb}|$ obtained using HQET, gives

$$A = 0.794 \pm 0.049 \pm 0.025 \tag{59}$$

A very precise value of $|V_{cb}|$ is desirable in order to check the unitarity of the CKM matrix as well as for a number of phenomenological applications. For example, one of the largest uncertainties in the determination of the location of the vertex in the ρ, η plane using ϵ, the CP violation parameter in kaon decay is the parameter A. In other words, in order to interpret CP violation in the kaon sector and predict the magnitude of CP asymmetries for B mesons, a precise measurement of $|V_{cb}|$ is required. In addition, as emphasized by Buras [355], rates for certain rare kaon decays such as $K_L \to \pi^0 \ell^+ \ell^-$, $K_L \to \pi^0 \nu \bar{\nu}$ depend on $|V_{cb}|^4$. It will be worthwhile to test the Standard Model and verify that the value of $|V_{cb}|$ from such loop induced decays in the kaon sector agree with the value of $|V_{cb}|$ from tree level semileptonic B decays.

C. The CKM element $|V_{ub}|$

In the Wolfenstein parameterization, the value of $|V_{ub}/V_{cb}|$ is approximately $\lambda\ |\rho - i\eta|$. Thus the measured value of this ratio constrains the vertex of the Bjorken triangle (see Fig. 60) to lie on a circle of radius $\lambda\ \sqrt{\rho^2 + \eta^2}$ in the $\rho - \eta$ plane.

The value of this ratio is determined from measurements of inclusive $b \to u\ell\nu$ decays. Using the central value from the ACCMM model gives

$$|\frac{V_{ub}}{V_{cb}}| = 0.073 \pm 0.011(\text{exp}) \pm 0.01(\text{model}) \tag{60}$$

where the first error is the sum in quadrature of the experimental statistical and systematic errors and the second error is due to model dependence. Quantifying model dependence is difficult. An alternate way is to give the allowed range,

$$0.055 < |V_{ub}/V_{cb}| < 0.095,$$

which corresponds to a one standard deviation variation on each of the models considered. The measurement of $|V_{ub}/V_{cb}|$ gives the constraint $\sqrt{\rho^2 + \eta^2} = 0.331 \pm 0.067$. At present, a large uncertainty in the radius of this circular region in the ρ, η plane is due to the model dependence in the extraction of $|V_{ub}|$. This may be improved with additional theoretical work as well as the observation of exclusive charmless semileptonic decays.

D. The CKM element $|V_{td}|$

In the Standard Model, ΔM_d for $B_d - \bar{B}_d$ mixing is

$$\Delta M_d = \frac{G_F^2}{6\pi^2} m_B m_t^2 \; F(\frac{m_t^2}{m_W^2}) \; \eta_{QCD} B_{B_d} f_{B_d}^2 |V_{tb}^* V_{td}|^2$$

where G_F is the weak coupling constant, m_t is the top quark mass, F is a slowly decreasing function which depends on m_t and m_W, η_{QCD} is a factor which accounts for QCD corrections, B_{B_d} is a constant which is used to account for the vacuum insertion approximation, and f_B is the decay constant of the B_d meson.

Since the mass of the top quark has been determined ($m_t = 179 \pm 10$), and the QCD correction has recently been calculated to NLO by Buras, Jamin, and Weisz [179] ($\eta_{QCD} = 0.55$), the largest remaining uncertainties in ΔM_d arise from the product $B_{B_d}^{1/2} f_{B_d}$. This last factor must be determined from non-perturbative methods such as lattice QCD, QCD sum rules, or potential models. One estimate is $B_{B_d}^{1/2} f_{B_d} = 180 \pm 50$ MeV. This covers the range found in the lattice calculations by the UKQCD, ELC, and Bernard *et al.* groups [275]. However, this estimate should be regarded with considerable caution and the assigned error may be an underestimate.

Using these parameters and the world average for $\Delta M_{B_d} = 0.468 \pm 0.026(\text{ps})^{-1}$ gives

$$|V_{td}| = (0.92 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.09 \pm 0.24) \times 10^{-2}$$

where the first error is statistical, the second is due to the top quark mass, and the third is the uncertainty in the product $B_{B_d}^{1/2} f_{B_d}$. At present, the experimental limits on $B \to \tau\nu$ from ALEPH and CLEO II give the constraint $f_{B_d} < 2.6$ GeV. A factor of ten improvement in sensitivity is required to reach the range of interest for f_B. A complementary approach is to measure the decay constants of charmed mesons (i.e. f_{D_s}, f_{D^+}) which can be used to verify the lattice calculations and then be scaled to the B mass.

Since

$$V_{td} = A\lambda^3(1 - \rho - i\eta)$$

in the usual parameterization, the modulus is

$$|V_{td}|^2 = A^2\lambda^6\{(1-\rho)^2 + \eta^2\}.$$

Thus, a precise determination of $|V_{td}|$ constrains the vertex of the Bjorken triangle to lie on a circle centered at $\rho = 1$, $\eta = 0$ with radius $A\lambda^3$ and further reduces the allowed range of CP asymmetries in the Standard Model. At present, the experimental measurements give the constraint,

$$\sqrt{(1-\rho^2) + \eta^2} = 1 \pm 0.3.$$

E. The CKM element $|V_{ts}|$

The CKM parameter $|V_{ts}|$ can be extracted from a measurement of the branching fraction for the electromagnetic penguin. There are many calculations of the inclusive rate for $b \to s\gamma$

[318], [319]. The rate has a logarithmic dependence on the top quark mass, m_t, and is proportional to the product of CKM matrix elements $|V_{ts}V_{tb}|^2$. Large leading order QCD corrections increase the rate by a factor of about 3.5. Using the measurement $m_t = 179 \pm 10$ GeV, and allowing the range of mass scales, μ, at which the QCD corrections are evaluated, to vary between $m_b/2$ and $2m_b$, Buras *et al.* calculate the inclusive rate to be $(2.8 \pm 0.8) \times 10^{-4}$ [356]. This prediction is completely consistent with the experimental results discussed in the previous section. The theoretical uncertainty from the scale dependence (μ) should be significantly reduced when a calculation including next to leading order QCD corrections is completed. Ali and London have used the new experimental bounds to determine the range of possible values for the ratio CKM matrix element $|V_{ts}/V_{cb}|$ [357]:

$$0.62 < |V_{ts}/V_{cb}| < 1.1$$

which is expected from unitarity to be close to 1.

Using heavy quark symmetry, the $D \to K^*$ and $B \to K^*$ form factors can be related at certain kinematic points. Models are then used to extrapolate and obtain form factors for the entire kinematic range in $B \to K^*$ decays. Using experimentally measured form factors for $D \to K^* \ell \nu$, the measured branching ratio for $B \to K^* \gamma$ can then be used to determine a value of $|V_{ts}|$. Griffin, Masip and McGuigan have carried out this program and find $|V_{ts}| = 0.026 \pm 0.006(\text{exp}) \pm 0.011(\text{theo})$ where the first error is from experimental data and the second arises from theoretical uncertainties [359].

F. The ratio $|V_{ts}/V_{td}|$

In the future, measurements of $B_s - \bar{B}_s$ mixing may allow the determination of $|V_{ts}/V_{td}|$ in a manner which is fairly independent of hadronic uncertainties. This would constrain the quantity $|1 - \rho - i\eta|$ and circumvent the problems associated with hadronic uncertainties in $B_d - \bar{B}_d$ mixing. The existing limit from ALEPH on $B_s - \bar{B}_s$ mixing implies

$$\frac{\Delta m_s}{\Delta m_d} = (1.2 \pm 0.1)|\frac{V_{ts}}{V_{td}}|^2 > 7.9 \Longrightarrow |\frac{V_{ts}}{V_{td}}| > 3.0.$$

This gives the constraint

$$\sqrt{(1-\rho)^2 + \eta^2} < 1.5$$

with minimal uncertainties from non-perturbative physics. This is slightly better than the bound from the unitarity of the CKM matrix.

Using the constraint ($\sqrt{(1-\rho^2) + \eta^2} = 1 \pm 0.3$) obtained from B_d mixing and the relation $x_d/x_s = (1/f)\lambda^2|(1 - \rho - i\eta)|^2$ gives $x_s/x_d = 13.2 \pm 7.9$ where f takes into account $SU(3)$ breaking and is assumed to be 1.25 ± 0.1 [283], [358]. This implies $x_s = 19 \pm 11$. The Standard Model parameters preferred in a recent fit by Ali and London [357], which uses all available experimental constraints, also indicate that x_s is large,

$$x_s = 19.4 \pm 6.9$$

for $f_{B_s}\sqrt{B_{B_s}} = 230$ MeV. Such rapid time dependent oscillations of the B_s meson will be extremely difficult to measure in future experiments at high energy colliders or asymmetric B factories.

The ratio $|V_{td}/V_{ts}|$ may be determined from a comparison of the decay rates for $B \to \rho\gamma$ (or $B \to \omega\gamma$) and $B \to K^*\gamma$. In this ratio many of the theoretical uncertainties are expected to cancel.

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}(B^- \to \rho^-\gamma)}{\mathcal{B}(B^- \to K^{*-}\gamma)} = \frac{\mathcal{B}(B^0 \to \rho^0\gamma) + \mathcal{B}(B^0 \to \omega\gamma)}{\mathcal{B}(B^- \to K^{*-}\gamma)} = \xi|\frac{V_{td}}{V_{ts}}|^2$$

where the factor ξ accounts for SU(3) breaking effects. This gives limits on $|V_{td}/V_{ts}|$ between 0.64 and 0.75 for different models of $SU(3)$ breaking in the form factors. The possible contribution of long distance effects in this ratio is still in dispute [324], [325], [326], [327]. For example, Cheng [325] finds that the decay $B \to \rho\gamma$ is dominated by the short distance penguin and gives a possible 10-20% contribution to the amplitude from long distance effects. If these long distance effects can be shown to be manageable, then this ratio will also provide useful constraints in the future.

G. CP Violation

The three internal angles of the Bjorken triangle can be expressed in terms of CKM elements

$$\alpha \equiv arg\left(\frac{V_{ud}V_{ub}^*}{V_{td}V_{tb}^*}\right), \quad \beta \equiv arg\left(\frac{V_{cd}V_{cb}^*}{V_{td}V_{tb}^*}\right), \quad \gamma \equiv arg\left(\frac{V_{cd}V_{cb}^*}{V_{ud}V_{ub}^*}\right).$$

These angles can be measured indirectly once each of the CKM elements is precisely determined. The allowed values for the upper vertex of the unitarity triangle is shown in Figure 61 [357]. It is also possible to determine the angles directly from observations of time dependent CP asymmetries in $\bar{B}^0$ decay. The ultimate goal is to measure both the angles and the CKM couplings to high precision and overconstrain the Standard Model. If a inconsistency is found, this would provide an indication for New Physics.

Large CP violating asymmetries in the B_d system are generated by $B - \bar{B}$ mixing. The simplest case to consider is a process where the final state is a CP eigenstate,$|f_{CP}>$. The amplitude for the direct decay and the amplitude for the process where the B mixes to a $\bar{B}$ which then decays to the same final state cannot be distinguished. If the two amplitudes have some relative phase, then a measurable interference effect will be generated. As noted by A. Sanda, this is analogous to the double slit interference experiment of classical physics. The CP violating asymmetry is due to the analogue of the path difference, which in this case is introduced by $B - \bar{B}$ mixing.

The time dependent rates for an initially pure state to decay to a CP eigenstate $|f_{CP}>$ is given by

$$\Gamma(B^0(t) \to |f>) \propto |A|^2 \exp^{-\Gamma t}(1 \pm Im(\lambda)\sin(\Delta M_d t))$$

where the plus sign obtains for B^0 and the minus sign for $\bar{B^0}$. This gives a time dependent CP asymmetry

$$A(t) = 2Im\lambda \sin(\Delta M_d t)$$

For the case $|f_{CP}>= \psi K_s$, $\mathrm{Im}\lambda = -\sin(2\beta)$ the expected asymmetry is of order 0.6. Similarly, modes such as $\bar{B}^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$ may give asymmetries proportional to $\sin(2\alpha)$ which will also probably be order 0.2-1.0 . These asymmetries are considerably larger than the characteristic scale of asymmetries in the kaon sector, which are typically of order 10^{-3}.

FIG. 61. The allowed region in the ρ, η plane as determined from measurements of B decays and ϵ from kaon decay. The dashed circles correspond to the constraints from the limits for B_s mixing with different assumptions on $SU(3)$ breaking [357].

However, the branching fraction of the B_d meson to CP eigenstates is small and it is difficult to produce large numbers of B mesons.

An additional complication arises when considering production at the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance where the $B\bar{B}$ meson pairs are produced in a coherent state. The restrictions of quantum statistics lead to a CP asymmetry which depends on the difference of the decay times of the B^0 and $\bar{B}^0$ mesons. This also has the unfortunate side effect that time integrated CP asymmetries for B_d mesons vanish [364].

Several solutions to this difficulty have been proposed. One alternative is to operate the experiment at a center of mass energy just above the threshold where $\bar{B}B^*$ pairs are produced. In this case, time integrated asymmetries no longer vanish but the cross section is lower by at least a factor of five. Or one can operate at the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance with asymmetric energy beams. The center of mass frame will be boosted and the B decay lengths will be dilated to measurable distances. The latter solution has been chosen by the SLAC and KEK laboratories. Another possibility is to take advantage of the large cross sections for hadronic production of B mesons at either hadron collider of fixed target experiments. In this case, B mesons should be produced incoherently but it is quite challenging to trigger and operate the experiment in a very high rate environment. The high luminosity B factory projects are discussed in detail elsewhere [6], [8], [9], [10], [11].

XVII. CONCLUSIONS

Significant progress in the physics of B mesons has been made in the last several years. Improved measurements of branching fractions for semileptonic decays in conjunction with

more precise measurements of exclusive B lifetimes from LEP and CDF have improved the knowledge of the CKM matrix elements $|V_{cb}|$ and $|V_{ub}|$. A number of experimental and theoretical approaches to a model independent determination of $|V_{ub}|$ have been proposed. These will be one of the foci of experimental efforts in the future.

Improved determinations of the $B_d - \bar{B}_d$ mixing parameters from CLEO II and the LEP experiments, as well as the determination of the top quark mass at CDF and D0 have reduced the allowed range for the CKM element $|V_{td}|$. The LEP experiments have provided the first evidence for time dependent oscillations of neutral B mesons. These experiments have also provided useful constraints on the $B_s - \bar{B}_s$ mixing parameter, which can be to constrain $|V_{ts}|/V_{td}|$. Measurement of the $B_s - \bar{B}_s$ oscillation frequency is a major experimental challenge for the high energy collider experiments.

Results from CLEO II have significantly modified our understanding of hadronic B decay. The data and measurements of branching fractions are now of sufficient quality to perform non-trivial tests of the factorization hypothesis including comparisons of rates for $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}X^-$ (where $X^- = \pi^-, \rho^-$, or a_1^-) with rates for $D^{*+}\ell^-\bar{\nu}$ at $q^2 = M_X^2$, as well as comparisons of the polarizations in $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\rho^-$ with $\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\ell^-\bar{\nu}_\ell$. In all cases, the factorization hypothesis is consistent with the data at the present level of experimental precision and for $q^2 < m_{a_1}^2$.

Improved measurements of branching ratios of two-body decays with a final state ψ meson have been reported from ARGUS and CLEO II. The decay $B \to \psi K^*$ is strongly polarized with $\Gamma_L/\Gamma = (78 \pm 7)$ %. Therefore, this mode will be useful for measuring CP violation.

There is no evidence for color suppressed decays to a charmed meson and light neutral hadron in the final state. The most stringent limit, $\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^0\pi^0)/\mathcal{B}(\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\pi^-) < 0.07$ from CLEO II, is still above the level where these color suppressed B decays are expected in most models. The observation of $B \to \psi$ modes shows that color suppressed decays are present. Using results on exclusive $B \to \psi$ decays from CLEO 1.5, CLEO II and ARGUS, we find a value of the BSW parameter $|a_2| = 0.23 \pm 0.01 \pm 0.01$. We also report a new value for the BSW parameter $|a_1| = 1.03 \pm 0.04 \pm 0.06$. By comparing rates for B^- and $\bar{B}^0$ modes, it has been shown that the sign of a_2/a_1 is positive, in contrast to what is found in charm decays.

There has been dramatic progress in the study of rare decays. CLEO II has reported evidence for charmless hadronic B decay in the sum of $B \to K^+\pi^-$ and $B \to \pi^+\pi^-$ and has observed the first direct evidence for the radiative penguin decay $B \to K^*\gamma$ with a branching fraction of $(4.5 \pm 1.5 \pm 0.9) \times 10^{-5}$ consistent with Standard Model expectations for a heavy top quark. CLEO II has also succeeded in observing the inclusive process, $b \to s\gamma$ and finds $\mathcal{B}(b \to s\gamma) = (2.32 \pm 0.57 \pm 0.35) \times 10^{-4}$. These results restrict the allowed range for $|V_{ts}|$ and constrain physics beyond the Standard Model.

Large samples of reconstructed hadronic decays will be obtained in the next few years by the CLEO II collaboration as a result of further improvements in the luminosity of CESR, and in the performance of the CLEO II detector. There will also be significant increases in the size of data samples available to the CDF experiment. These will permit accurate tests of the factorization hypothesis over the full q^2 range. The large tagged sample at CLEO can be used to study inclusive properties of B^+ and B^0 decays and constrain f_B via $B^+ \to \tau^+\nu$. Measurements of additional decays to final states with charmonium mesons will be performed and other color suppressed decays will be observed.

Larger data samples should allow further results to be obtained on rare B decays including the observation of $B^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$, $B^0 \to K^+\pi^-$ and a measurement of the inclusive process $b \to s$ gluon. The measurement of several rare hadronic decays would provide information on the relative importance of the penguin and spectator amplitudes. Additional electromagnetic penguin decays such as $B \to \rho(\omega)\gamma$, $B \to K^{**}\gamma$, and $B \to K^*\ell^+\ell^-$ may be observed. These provide further constraints on the Standard Model parameters $|V_{ts}|$ and $|V_{td}|$, as well as on extensions of the Standard Model.

The ultimate goal of the study of B mesons is to measure the large CP asymmetries predicted by the Standard Model in decay modes such as $\bar{B}^0 \to \psi K^0$, $\bar{B} \to \pi^+\pi^-$ and $B^- \to D^0 K^-$. In order to throughly test the consistency of the Standard Model's description of CP violation in these decays, the mechanisms of B decay must be well understood. This review shows that rapid progress is being made in this program.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge the essential contributions of Dr. S. Playfer to an earlier version of this review. We have also benefitted from the reviews of S. Stone and the review of J.D. Richman and P. Burchat on semileptonic charm and beauty decays. We thank H. Albrecht, V. Barger, C. Bebek, D. Cassel, P. Colangelo, J.E. Duboscq, F. DeJongh, I. Dunietz, E. Golowich, J. Hewett, A. Jawahery, Y.Y. Keum, K. Kinoshita, S. Menary, M. Neubert, C. Nixdorf, X.Y. Pham, A. Ryd, J. D. Richman, V. Rieckert, J. Rodriguez, S. Pakvasa, W. Palmer, K. Schubert, B. Stech, R. Wanke, and M. Zoeller for useful discussions and help in preparation of this review. We thank our colleagues from the CLEO, ARGUS, CDF, ALEPH, OPAL, DELPHI and L3 experiments for their contributions to the work discussed in this review. We thank the Department of Energy, the University of Hawaii and Ohio State University for their unwavering support.

REFERENCES

[1] M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, Progr. Theor. Phys. **49**, 652 (1973).
[2] L. Wolfenstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **51**, 1915 (1983).
[3] A.D. Sakharov, Pis'ma Zh. Ekps. Teor. Fiz. **5** (1967) 32.
[4] M. Dine, R.G. Leigh, P. Huet, A. Linde, and D. Linde, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 550 (1992). Also see M.B. Gavela, P. Hernandez,J. Orloff, O. Pène, and C. Quimbay, Nucl. Phys. **B** 430, 382 (1995).
[5] L.L. Chau and W.Y. Keung, Phys. Rev. Lett. **53**, 1802 (1984).
[6] Letter of intent for the Study of CP Violation and Heavy Flavor Physics at PEPII, The BABAR collaboration, SLAC report SLAC-443 1994.
[7] The CLEO III Detector Proposal, Cornell preprint CLNS 94/1277.
[8] K. Abe et al., Physics and Detector of Asymmetric B Factory at KEK, KEK Report 90-23 (1991). Also see Letter of Intent for A Study of CP Violation in B Meson Decays, KEK Report 94-2, April 1994.
[9] HERA-B Collaboration, T. Lohse *et al.*, Letter of Intent, HERA-B An Experiment to Study CP Violation in the B System Using an Internal Target at the HERA Proton Ring, DESY PRC 94/02, 1994.
[10] CDF-DOC-ADVISORY-PUBLIC/2436.
[11] CERN reports: CERN-LHCC/92-3, CERN-LHCC/92-4, CERN-LHCC/93-50, and CERN/LHCC 93-54.
[12] Early references on the use of factorization in kaon and hyperon decay include: S. Oneda and A. Wakasa, Nucl. Phys. 1,445(1956), S. Oneda, J.C. Pati and B. Sakita, Phys. Rev. D **119**, 482 (1960), R. P. Feynman, Symmetries in Elementary Particle Physics, Ed. A. Zichichi,(Academic Press, N.Y.,1965),p.111, I. Yu. Kobzarev and L.B. Okun, Yad.Fiz.1,1134(1965), T. Hayashi and M. Nakagawa, Progress Theoret. Phys. 35,515(1965), J. Schwinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. 12,630(1964), S. Pakvasa, Proc. of the XXth International Conf. H.E.P., Madison, 1980, ed L.Durand and L.Pondrom,AIP,1981, p.1164. S. Pakvasa and J. Trampetic, Z. Phys. C **24**, 381 (1983).
[13] J. Bjorken, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl) **11**, 325 (1989).
[14] J. Bartelt *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 511 (1993). S. Stone "Semileptonic B Decays", B decays, ed. S. Stone, World Scientific (1994).
[15] R. Ammar *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 674 (1993).
[16] J.L. Hewett, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1045 (1993).
[17] M. Gell-Mann and A. Pais, Phys. Ref **97** (1955) 1387.
[18] H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **192**, 245 (1987).
[19] S.W. Herb *et al.*(CFS Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **39**, 252 (1977).
[20] Ch. Berger *et al.*(PLUTO Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **76**, 243 (1978).
[21] C.W. Darden *et al.*(DASP II Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **76**, 246 (1978).
[22] J. K. Bienlein *et al.*(DASP II Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **78**, 360 (1978), C.W. Darden *et al.*(DASP II Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **78**, 364 (1978).
[23] D. Andrews *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **44**, 1108 (1980).
[24] T. Böhringer *et al.*(CUSB Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **44**, 1111 (1980).
[25] Particle Data Group, K. Hikasa *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 1173 (1994).
[26] S. Behrends *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **50**, 881 (1983).

[27] M.S. Alam *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **36**, 1289 (1987).
[28] D. Bortoletto *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **45**, 21 (1992).
[29] The integrated luminosities quoted here are for the $\Upsilon(4S)$ data samples only.
[30] H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **185**, 218 (1987).
[31] H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **215**, 424 (1988).
[32] H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS Collaboration), Z. Phys. C **48**, 543 (1990).
[33] H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS Collaboration), Z. Phys. C **54**, 1 (1992).
[34] M.S. Alam *et al.*(CLEO II Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **50**, 43 (1994).
[35] M. Battle *et al.*(CLEO II Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 3922 (1993).
[36] M. Catanesi *et al.*(WA78 Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **187**, 431 (1987); P. Bordalo *et al.*(NA10 Collaboration), Z. Phys. C **39**, 7 (1988)
[37] K. Kodama *et al.*(E653 Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **303**, 359 (1993).
[38] R. Jesik *et al.*(E672, E705 Collaborations), Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 495 (1995).
[39] T. Bergfeld *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), submitted to Physics Review D.
[40] B. Barish *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **51**, 1014 (1995).
[41] G. Fox and S. Wolfram, Phys. Rev. Lett. 41, 1581 (1978).
[42] The definitions of thrust, sphericity and $s_\perp$ can be found in the contribution of M. Artuso to B decays, ed. S. Stone, World Scientific (1994).
[43] N. Roe, contribution to the Proceedings of the 1992 SLAC Summer Institute, Stanford, CA., LBL preprint LBL-33748.
[44] Y. Kubota *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Nucl. Inst. and Meth. A **320**, 66 (1992); the crystal performance is described in R. Morrison *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 1696 (1991).
[45] ARGUS used $D \to K_s$ modes.
[46] The resolution in beam constrained mass has a weak dependence on the decay channel. It varies between 2.6 MeV to 3.3 MeV.
[47] These are the fractions determined in the CLEO II analysis. The lowest fraction is for the mode $\bar{B^0} \to D^{*+}\rho^-$ while the highest fraction is for the mode $B^- \to D^0\pi^-$.
[48] In the ARGUS experiment the beam constrained mass distributions were fitted to a slightly different background function with a kinematic threshold. The functional form of the background shape used was

$$f(x) = c_1 x \left(\sqrt{(1-(\frac{x}{E_{beam}})^2}\right) e^{c_2(1-(\frac{x}{E_{beam}})^2)}$$

CLEO 1.5 fitted the beam constrained mass distributions to the sum of a gaussian signal of width 2.5 MeV (r.m.s) and a background function of the form $w_1\ p + w_2\ p^2$ where $p = \sqrt{E^2_{beam} - m^2}$ and the parameters w_1, w_2 are determined from the ΔE sidebands.
[49] See contribution of V. Sharma to B Decays ed. S. Stone World Scientific (1994).
[50] D.Akerib *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 3070 (1993).
[51] D.Acosta *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **49**, 5690 (1994).
[52] F. Butler *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2041 (1992).
[53] D. Coffman *et al.*(Mark III Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. 68, 282(1992).
[54] P. Roudeau, contribution to the proceedings of the ICHEP94 conference, Glasgow, Scotland.
[55] E. Eichten, B. Hill, C. Quigg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 4116 (1993).

[56] E. Fernandez *et al.*(MAC Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **51**, 1022 (1983).
[57] N.S. Lockyer *et al.*(MARK II Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **51**, 1316 (1983).
[58] See I.I. Bigi, B. Blok, M. Shifman, N. Uraltsev, and A. Vainshtein for a review of the current theoretical situation, contribution to B Decays ed. S. Stone, World Scientific (1994) and also available as CERN-TH-7132/94 (1994).
[59] D. Bortoletto *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **37**, 1719 (1988).
[60] C. P. Singh *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **24**, 788 (1981); L.-H. Chan Phys. Rev. Lett. **51**, 253 (1983); K. P. Tiwari *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 643 (1985); D. Y. Kim and S. N. Sinha, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **42**, 47 (1985).
[61] J. L. Goity and W. S. Hou, Phys. Lett. B **282**, 243 (1992); R. F. Lebed, Phys. Rev. D **47**, 1134 (1993).
[62] D.S. Akerib *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 1692 (1991).
[63] J. Wu *et al.*(CUSB Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **273**, 177 (1991).
[64] Adriani *et al.*(L3 Collaboration), Proceedings of the International Europhysics Conference on High Energy Physics, Marseille (1993).
[65] ALEPH Collaboration, paper 0598 submitted to the ICHEP94 conference in Glasgow, Scotland 1994.
[66] DELPHI Collaboration, paper 0305 submitted to the ICHEP94 conference in Glasgow, Scotland 1994.
[67] F.Abe *et al.*(CDF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 1685 (1993). Updated result J.D. Lewis (CDF Collaboration), Proceedings of the 8th Rencontre de Physique de la Vallee d'Aoste, La Thuile, Italy 1994.
[68] P.T. Acton *et al.*(OPAL Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **295**, 357 (1992) and Phys. Lett. B **337**, 196 (1994).
[69] D. Buskulic *et al.*(ALEPH Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **311**, 425 (1993)
[70] F. Abreu *et al.*(DELPHI Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **324**, 500 (1994).
[71] W. Kwong and J. Rosner, Phys. Rev. D **44**, 212 (1991).
[72] C. Albajar *et al.*(UA1 Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **273**, 540 (1991).
[73] M. Basile *et al.*, Nuov. Cim. Lett. 31, 97 (1981).
[74] D. Drijard *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **108**, 361 (1982).
[75] R. Forty, CERN preprint CERN-PPE/94-144, to appear in the Proceedings of the XIV International Conference on Physics in Collision, Tallahassee, 1994.
[76] OPAL Collaboration, Proceedings of the International Europhysics Conference on High Energy Physics, Marseille (1993).
[77] M. Jimack (OPAL Collaboration), contribution to the Proceedings of the Rencontres de Moriond, March 1995.
[78] A. Stochi, LAL 94-04, submitted to Physics Scripta.
[79] M. Gronau, A. Nippe, J. Rosner, Phys. Rev. D **47**, 1988 (1993).
[80] D. Akers *et al.*(OPAL Collaboration), CERN-PPE/94-206, submitted to Z. fur Physik C.
[81] F. Abreu *et al.*(DELPHI Collaboration), CERN-PPE/94-210, submitted to Physics Letters B.
[82] D. Bukuslic *et al.*(ALEPH Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **322**, 275 (1994). Note the value given in this paper for the B_s lifetime is slightly different from the value quoted at the ICHEP94 conference.

[83] D. Buskulic *et al.*(ALEPH Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **295**, 174 (1992).
[84] F. Abe *et al.*(CDF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 3421 (1993).
[85] P. Abreu *et al.*(DELPHI Collaboration), Z. Phys. C **63**, 3 (1994).
[86] W. Venus, contribution to the Proceedings of the 1993 Lepton-Photon Symposium, Ithaca, NY, edited by P. Drell and D. Rubin, AIP Press (1994).
[87] F. DeJongh, Fermilab preprint FERMILAB-CONF-94-245, to appear in the Proceedings of the ICHEP94, Glasgow, Scotland.
[88] CDF Collaboration, paper 0655 submitted to the ICHEP94 conference in Glasgow, Scotland 1994.
[89] F. Abe *et al.*(CDF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 3456 (1994)
[90] F. Abe *et al.*(CDF Collaboration), preprint FERMILAB-Pub-94-420E, submitted to Physical Review Letters.
[91] ALEPH Collaboration, paper 0602 submitted to the ICHEP94 conference in Glasgow, Scotland 1994.
[92] ALEPH Collaboration, paper 0579 submitted to the ICHEP94 conference in Glasgow, Scotland 1994.
[93] OPAL Collaboration, paper 0533 submitted to the ICHEP94 conference in Glasgow, Scotland 1994.
[94] DELPHI Collaboration, paper 0165 submitted to the ICHEP94 conference in Glasgow, Scotland 1994.
[95] D. Buskulic *et al.*(ALEPH COLLABORATION), CERN-PPE/93-214.
[96] P.D. Acton *et al.*(OPAL COLLABORATION), Phys. Lett. B **295**, 357 (1992).
[97] J. Bartelt *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), CLEO CONF 93-19, submitted to the 1993 Lepton Photon Conference, Physical Review D paper in preparation.
[98] J.D. Richman and P.R. Burchat, Reviews of Modern Physics in preparation.
[99] S.L. Stone, contribution to B Decays edited by S. Stone, World Scientific, Sinagopore (1994).
[100] J.G. Korner and G.A. Schuler, Z. Phys. C **38**, 511 (1988), erratum Z. Phys. C **41**, 690 (1989).
[101] M. Wirbel, B. Stech, and M. Bauer, Z. Phys. C **29**, 637 (1985); M. Bauer and M. Wirbel, Z. Phys. C **42**, 671 (1989).
[102] D. Scora and N. Isgur, CEBAF-TH-94-14. Also see D. Scora, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Toronto (1993).
[103] D. Atwood and W.J. Marciano, Phys. Rev. D **41**, 1736 (1990).
[104] H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **249**, 359 (1990).
[105] K. Wachs *et al.*(Crystal Ball Collaboration), Z. Phys. C **42**, 33 (1989).
[106] C. Yanagisawa *et al.*(CUSB Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 2436 (1991).
[107] S. Henderson *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **45**, 2212 (1992).
[108] W. Bacino *et al.*(DELCO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **43**, 1073 (1979).
[109] G. Altarelli, N. Cabibbo, G. Corbo, and L. Maiani, **Nucl. Phys. B207**, 365 (1982).
[110] N. Isgur, D. Scora, B. Grinstein, and M. B. Wise, Phys. Rev. D **39**, 799 (1989); N. Isgur and M. B. Wise, Phys. Lett. B **232**, 113 (1989); N. Isgur and M. B. Wise, Phys. Lett. B **237**, 527 (1990).
[111] H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **318**, 397 (1993).
[112] J. Gronberg *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), CLEO CONF 94-6, paper submitted to the

ICHEP94 conference in Glasgow. Also see R. Wang, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Minnesota (1994), unpublished.
[113] H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS Collaboration, Phys. Lett. B **324**, 249 (1994).
[114] M. Athanas *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 393 (1994).
[115] M.A. Lambrecht, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Oklahoma, 1993, (unpublished).
[116] M.S. Saulnier, Ph.D. Thesis, Harvard University 1995 (unpublished).
[117] D. Buskulic *et al.*(ALEPH Collaboration), Z. Phys. C **62**, 179 (1994).
[118] R. Akers *et al.*(OPAL Collaboration), Z. Phys. C **60**, 199 (1993).
[119] P. Abreu *et al.*(DELPHI Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **301**, 145 (1993).
[120] B. Adeva *et al.*(L3 Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **261**, 177 (1991).
[121] I. Bigi, B. Blok, M.A. Shifman and A. I. Vainshtein, Phys. Lett. B **323**, 408 (1994).
[122] I. Dunietz, P.S. Cooper, A.F. Falk and M. Wise, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 1075 (1994).
[123] W.F. Palmer and B. Stech, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 4174 (1993).
[124] A.L. Kagan, SLAC preprint SLAC-PUB-6626.
[125] A.F. Falk, Johns Hopkins University preprint JHU-TIPAC-940016.
[126] E. Bagan, P. Ball, V.M. Braun, and P. Gosdzinsky, Nucl. Phys. B **432**, 3 (1994).
[127] E. Bagan, P. Ball, V.M. Braun, and P. Gosdzinsky, Phys. Lett. B **342**, 362 (1995).
[128] K. Honscheid, K.R. Schubert and R. Waldi, Z. Phys. C **63**, 117 (1994).
[129] I. Scott (ALEPH Collaboration), contribution to the Proceedings of the ICHEP94 conference, Glasgow, Scotland.
[130] T. E. Browder (CLEO Collaboration), contribution to the Proceedings of the ICHEP94 conference, Glasgow, Scotland.
[131] M. Garcia Sciveres, Ph.D. Thesis, Cornell University 1994 (unpublished).
[132] X. Fu, Ph.D. Thesis, University of Oklahoma 1994 (unpublished).
[133] D. Buskulic *et al.*(ALEPH Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **345**, 103 (1995); R. Akers *et al.*(OPAL Collaboration), CERN PPE-95-02, submitted to Zeitschrift fur Physik C.
[134] M.B. Voloshin and M.A. Shifman, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **47**, 511 (1988).
[135] P. Colangelo, G. Nardulli, A.A. Ovchinnikov, and N. Paver, Phys. Lett. B **269**, 201 (1991).
[136] D. Buskulic *et al.*(ALEPH Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **298**, 478 (1993).
[137] D. Buskulic *et al.*(ALEPH Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **343**, 444 (1994).
[138] M. Acciarri *et al.*(L3 Collaboration), CERN PPE-95-05; B. Adeva *et al.*(L3 collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **332**, 201 (1994).
[139] P. Heiliger and L. M. Sehgal, Phys. Lett. B **229**, 409 (1989).
[140] A. Falk, Z. Ligeti, M. Neubert, and Y. Nir, Phys. Lett. B **326**, 145 (1994).
[141] P. Krawczyk and S. Pokorski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 182 (1988), B. Grzadkowski and W. S. Hou, Phys. Lett. B **283**, 427 (1992).
[142] H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS collaboration), Z. Phys. C **60**, 11 (1993).
[143] H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **249**, 359 (1993).
[144] M.E. Luke, Phys. Lett. B 252, 447 (1990).
[145] The known quantity $\mathcal{G}(y)$ is given by

$$\frac{G_F^2}{48\pi^3} m_{D^*}^3 (m_B - m_{D^*})^2 \times \sqrt{y^2-1}[4y(y+1)\frac{1-2yr+r^2}{(1-r)^2} + (y+1)^2]$$

where $r = m_{D^*}/m_B$.

[146] M. Neubert, SLAC report No. SLAC-PUB-6263, Phys. Rept. **245:**,259, 1994.
[147] M. Neubert, CERN report CERN-TH.7395/94, Phys. Lett. B **338**, 84 (1994).
[148] M. Neubert, Phys. Lett. B **341**, 367 (1995).
[149] T. Mannel, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 428 (1994).
[150] M. Shifman, N. Uraltsev, and A. Vainshtein, University of Minnesota report No. TPI-MINN-94/13-T.
[151] M. Shifman, TPI-MINN-94-31-T, hep/ph 9409358, to appear in the Proceedings of the ICHEP94 conference, Glasgow, Scotland.
[152] M. Shifman and N.G. Uralstev, University of Minnesota preprint No. TPI-MINN-94/41-T, hep-ph/9412398.
[153] P. Ball and U. Nierste, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 5841 (1994).
[154] J.G. Koerner and G.A. Schuler, Phys. Lett. B **226**, 185 (1989).
[155] K. Hagiwara, A.D. Martin and M. F. Wade,]PLB **228**, 144 (1989).
[156] F.J. Gilman and R.L. Singleton, Phys. Rev. D **41**, 142 (1990).
[157] J.G. Koerner and G.A. Schuler, Z. Phys. C **36**, 93 (1990).
[158] D.M. Schmidt, R.J. Morrison, and M.S. Witherell, Nucl. Instr. and Meth. **A328** 547 (1993).
[159] S. Sanghera *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **47**, 791 (1993).
[160] P. Avery *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), CLEO CONF 94-7, paper submitted to the ICHEP94 conference, Glasgow, Scotland.
[161] A. Ryd, Ph.D. thesis, University of California at Santa Barbara, 1995, unpublished.
[162] T. Miao, Ph.D. thesis, Purdue University 1995, unpublished.
[163] P. Ball, V.M. Braun, and H.G. Dosch, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 2110 (1993).
[164] C. Ramirez, J.F. Donoghue, and G. Burdman, Phys. Rev. D **41**, 1496 (1990).
[165] R. Fulton *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 16 (1990).
[166] H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **234**, 409 (1990).
[167] H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **255**, 297 (1991).
[168] J. Bartelt *et al.*(CLEO II Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 4111 (1993).
[169] J.K. Nelson, Ph.D. thesis, University of Minnesota 1994 (unpublished).
[170] M. Artuso, Phys. Lett. B **311**, 307 (1993).
[171] H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B.255, 297 (1991).
[172] A. Bean *et al.*(CLEO II Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 2681 (1993).
[173] N. Isgur and M. Wise, Phys. Rev. D **42**, 2388 (1990).
[174] G. Burdman, Z. Ligeti, M. Neubert and Y. Nir, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 2331 (1994).
[175] C. Dib and F. Vera, Phys. Rev. D **47**, 3938 (1993).
[176] R. Akhoury, G. Sterman, and Y.P. Yao, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 358 (1994).
[177] The angle between the π and the lepton in the W center of mass frame is expected to follow a $\sin^2\theta_{\ell\pi}$ distribution for a pseudoscalar to pseudoscalar semileptonic decay.
[178] L. K. Gibbons (CLEO II Collaboration), contribution to the Proceedings of the Rencontres de Moriond, March 1995.
[179] A.J. Buras, M. Jamin, and P.H. Weisz, Nucl. Phys. **B 347**, 491, (1990).
[180] H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **192**, 245 (1987).
[181] M. Artuso *et al.*(CLEO 1.5 Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 2233 (1989).
[182] H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS Collaboration), Z. Phys. C **55**, 357 (1992).
[183] J. Bartelt *et al.*(CLEO II Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 1680 (1993).

[184] M. S. Saulnier, Ph.D. Thesis, Harvard University 1995 (unpublished).
[185] R. Forty, CERN preprint CERN-PPE/94-154, to appear in the Proceedings of the ICHEP94, Glasgow, Scotland.
[186] Y. Pan (ALEPH Collaboration), contribution to the Proceedings of the ICHEP94 Conference, Glasgow, Scotland; D. Buskulic *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **322**, 441 (1994); The first evidence for time dependent mixing is described in D. Buskulic *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **313**, 498 (1993).
[187] P. Abreu *et al.*(DELPHI Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **338**, 409 (1994). Also see P. Billoir (DELPHI Collaboration), contribution to the Proceedings of the ICHEP94 Conference, Glasgow, Scotland.
[188] R. Akers *et al.*(OPAL Collaboration), CERN PPE-95-12, submitted to Zeitschrift fur Physik C; R. Akers *et al.*(OPAL Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **336**, 585 (1994); R. Akers *et al.*(OPAL Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **327**, 411 (1994); Also see S. Komamiya (OPAL Collaboration), contribution to the Proceedings of the ICHEP94 Conference, Glasgow, Scotland.
[189] The usual jet charge is defined by $Q_{jet} = \frac{\Sigma q_i p_{||}^{\alpha}}{p_{||}^{\alpha}}$ where α is a tunable parameter near 1 and $p_{||}$ is the momentum component parallel to the jet direction. To avoid bias from the high momentum lepton, the ALEPH analysis replaces the weighting by the momentum parallel to the jet axis with the rapidity of the i-th particle. Another variation is the OPAL analysis which uses momentum dependent weighting but uses $\alpha = 1$ for the opposite side (tagging) jet and the $\alpha = 0$ for the jet which contains the D^{*+} $l^{-}\nu$ candidate.
[190] J. Hagelin, Nucl Phys. B 193 (1981), 123. See also A.J. Buras, W. Stominiski, and H. Steger, Nucl Phys. B 245 (1984), 369; M.B. Voloshin, N.G. Uraltsev, V.A. Khoze, and M.A. Shifman, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **46**, 112, 1987.
[191] R. Aleksan, A. Le Yaouanc, L. Oliver, O. Pène, and J.C. Raynal, Phys. Lett. B 316, 567 (1993).
[192] T.E. Browder and S. Pakvasa, University of Hawaii preprint UH 511-814-95.
[193] B. Gittelman and S. Stone, CLNS 87/81; M. Ito, PhD Thesis, Cornell University 1989.
[194] H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS Collaboration), Z. Phys. C **54**, 13 (1992).
[195] F. Abe *et al.*(CDF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 3704 (1992).
[196] M. S. Alam *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 1814 (1987); G. Crawford *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **45**, 572 (1992).
[197] H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS Collaboration), Z. Phys. C **62**, 371 (1994); H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS Collaboration), DESY 93-084 1993; H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS Collaboration), Z. Phys. C **58**, 191 (1993); H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS Collaboration), Z. Phys. C **58**, 199 (1993).
[198] The importance of measurements of inclusive B decays for future experiments is discussed at length in I. Dunietz, Fermilab preprint FERMILAB-PUB-94-163-T.
[199] H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS Collaboration), Z. Phys. C **52**, 353 (1991); H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS Collaboration), Z. Phys. C **54**, 1 (1992).
[200] D. Bortoletto *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **45**, 21 (1992); D. Bortoletto *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 2117 (1990).
[201] M. Wirbel and Y.-L. Wu, Phys. Lett. B **288**, 430 (1989).

[202] F. Muheim (CLEO Collaboration), contribution to the proceedings of 1994 Division of Particles and Fields Meeting, Alburquerque, New Mexico.
[203] H. Pietschmann and H. Rupertsberger, Z. Phys. C **27**, 93 (1993).
[204] H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **199**, 451 (1987).
[205] R. Balest *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Cornell preprint CLNS 94/1315, 1994 submitted to Physical Review D. Also see S. Schrenk, Ph.D. thesis University of Minnesota (1994), unpublished.
[206] J.P. Alexander *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Cornell preprint CLNS 94/1291 to appear in Physics Letters B.
[207] F. Abe *et al.*(CDF Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 2537 (1993); F. Abe *et al.*(CDF Collaboration) Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 3704 (1992).
[208] P. Abreu *et al.*(DELPHI Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **341**, 109 (1994), L3 Collaboration, Phys. Lett. B **317**, 467 (1993) and Phys. Lett. B **288**, 412 (1992).
[209] D. Coffman. Electromagnetic Radiative Corrections to the Process $\psi \to \ell^+\ell^-$. In preparation (1994).
[210] Y. Kubota *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), ψ production in the $\Upsilon(4S)$ Energy Region, submitted to the 1991 Geneva Lepton-Photon conference. This paper also sets upper limits on ψ meson production from non-$B\bar{B}$ decay of the $\Upsilon(4S)$ resonance.
[211] K. Honscheid, Proceedings of the Rencontres de Moriond 1992, Editions Frontieres.
[212] H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **340**, 217 (1994)
[213] K.E. Ohl (CDF Collaboration), Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory preprint FERMILAB-CONF-94/127-E, to appear in the Proceedings of the 1994 DPF conference, Alburquerque, New Mexico, 1994.
[214] H.Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **277**, 209 (1992)
[215] G.T. Bodwin, E. Braaten, T.C. Yuan, and G.P. Lepage, Phys. Rev. D **46**, R3703 (1992).
[216] J.H. Kühn, S. Nussinov and R. Rückl, Z. Phys. C **5**, 117 (1980).
[217] M. Wise, contribution to the Proceedings of the 1993 Lepton-Photon Symposium, Ithaca, NY, edited by P. Drell and D. Rubin, AIP Press (1994).
[218] W.F.Palmer and B. Stech, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 4174 (1993).
[219] H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS Collaboration), Z. Phys. C **42**, 519 (1989) and H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **210**, 263 (1988).
[220] G. Crawford *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **45**, 752 (1992).
[221] I. Dunietz, P.S. Cooper, A.F. Falk and M. Wise, PRL 73, 1075 (1994).
[222] D. Cinabro *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), CLEO CONF 94-8, paper submitted to the ICHEP94 conference in Glasgow. Also see contribution of P. Baringer, Proceedings of the 1994 Meeting of the Division of Particles and Fields, Alburquerque, New Mexico.
[223] Y. Kubota *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), CLEO CONF 94-13, paper submitted to the ICHEP94 conference in Glasgow. Also see contribution of R.E.P. Davis, to appear in the Proceedings of the Conference.
[224] D. Cinabro*et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), CLEO CONF 94-8, paper submitted to the ICHEP94 conference in Glasgow. Also see contribution of R.E.P. Davis, to appear in the Proceedings of the Conference.
[225] M. Procario *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 1472 (1994).
[226] A.F. Falk, M.B. Wise and I. Dunietz, Preprint hep/ph-940534, CALT-68-1933

[227] M. Zoeller, Ph.D. thesis, State University of New York at Albany, 1994, (unpublished).
[228] Two models are considered: non-resonant $B \to D\pi^-\pi^0$ and $B \to D^{**}(2460)\pi^-$. Both give very similar $\pi^-\pi^0$ mass spectra and comparable limits on the non-rho contamination in the signal region.
[229] CLEO II considers two models: (1) The $\pi^-\pi^0$ system is produced non-resonantly following a phase space distribution or (2) the $D^{*+}\pi^-\pi^0$ is produced from the decay $D^{**}\pi^-$. Both give similar limits on the non-ρ fraction.
[230] H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS Collaboration), DESY preprint DESY-94-069. Also see P. Krieger, contribution to the Proceedings of the McGill Heavy Flavour Physics Conference (1993).
[231] S. Henderson *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **45**, 2212 (1992).
[232] D. Bortoletto *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 2117 (1990).
[233] M. Daoudi *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. D **45**, 3965 (1992).
[234] I. Dunietz, H. Quinn, A. Synder, W. Toki, and H.J. Lipkin, Phys. Rev. D **43**, 2193 (1991).
[235] M. Neubert, V. Rieckert, Q. P. Xu and B. Stech in *Heavy Flavours*, edited by A. J. Buras and H. Lindner (World Scientific, Singapore, 1992).
[236] G. Kramer and W.F. Palmer, Phys. Lett. B **279**, 181 (1992).
[237] M. Gourdin, A.N. Kamal, and X. Y. Pham, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 3355 (1994).
[238] X.Y. Pham and Y. Y. Keum, University of Paris preprint PAR/LPTHE/95-01, hep-ph/9501257 and University of Paris preprint PAR/LPTHE/94-44, hep-ph/9501360.
[239] R. Aleksan, A. Le Yauoanc, L. Oliver, O. Pène, J.C. Raynal, Orsay preprint LPTHE-Orsay 94/15, DAPNIA/SPP/94-24.
[240] M. Gourdin, Y.Y. Keum, and X.Y. Pham, University of Paris preprint, PAR-LPTHE-94-32, hep-ph/9409221.
[241] A.N. Kamal and A.B. Santra, University of Alberta preprint, Alberta Thy-31-94.
[242] A. Khodjamirian and R. Rückl, preprint hep-ph/9409378.
[243] The requirement that the colors match gives a factor of 1/3 in the amplitude. Moreover, the W couples to the $d\bar{d}$ part of the π^0 wave function so there is an additional factor of $1/\sqrt{2}$ in the amplitude. This is also true for the ρ^0 and the ω mesons. The numerical factor is different for the case of the $\eta/\eta^{'}$ system.
[244] I.Dunietz and A.Snyder, Phys. Rev. D **43**, 1593 (1991). The D^0 meson, however, must decay to a CP eigenstate e.g. $B \to D^0\pi^0$, $D^0 \to K^-K^+$ could be used.
[245] These modes are also accessible via the W-exchange graph which is expected to be small in B decay.
[246] We use the PDG values for the η, $\eta^{'}$ and ω branching ratios.
[247] J.R. Rodriguez, Ph.D. thesis, University of Florida 1995, (unpublished).
[248] In the mode $\bar{B^0} \to D^0\omega$, $\omega \to \pi^-\pi^+\pi^0$, Θ_N, the angle between the normal to the ω decay plane and the D^0 direction calculated in the D^0 rest frame, must satisfy $|\sin\Theta_N| > 0.6$.
[249] Ref. [25], p. III.38
[250] We make the approximation that $V_{ud},\ V_{cs} \approx 0.975$
[251] M. J. Dugan and B. Grinstein, Phys. Lett. B **255**, 583 (1991); and references therein.
[252] M. Bauer, B. Stech, and M. Wirbel, Z. Phys. C **29**, 637 (1985); *ibid* **34**, 103 (1987); *ibid* **42**, 671 (1989).

[253] M.A. Shifman, Nucl. Phys. B. **388**, 346 (1992).
[254] P. Colangelo, G. Nardulli, N. Paver Phys. Lett. B **293**, 207 (1992); P. Colangelo, F. De Fazio, G. Nardulli, Phys. Lett. B **303**, 152 (1993).
[255] The error is due to the uncertainty in the scale at which to evaluate the Wilson coefficient.
[256] D. Bortoletto and S.Stone, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 2951 (1990).
[257] X. Y. Pham, X. C. Vu, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 261 (1992).
[258] A value $f_\rho = 196$ MeV, often quoted in the literature, is derived from tau decays using the narrow width approximation i.e. by assuming the ρ resonance is a delta function.
[259] A.J. Weinstein, Internal CLEO note, not published.
[260] T.E. Browder, K. Honscheid and S. Playfer, "B Mesons", 2nd edition, ed. S. Stone, World Scientific (1994).
[261] C. Reader and N. Isgur, Phys. Rev. D **47**, 1007 (1993). The authors emphasize that their results for color suppressed decay have large theoretical uncertainties and are order of magnitude estimates rather than predictions.
[262] Since the form factor for $B \to D^*\ell\nu$ is slowly varying, the width of the ρ^- meson does not significantly modify the result.
[263] The q^2 spectrum has been corrected for the new values of the CLEO II D^* and D branching ratios. [50]
[264] J.Korner and G. Goldstein, Phys. Lett. B **89B**, 105 (1979).
[265] Peter Lepage (private communication). Also see V. Rieckert, Phys. Rev. D **47**, 3053 (1993).
[266] J.L. Rosner, Phys. Rev. D **42**, 3732 (1990).
[267] M. Neubert, Phys. Lett. B **264**, 455 (1991).
[268] V. Rieckert, Phys. Rev. D **47**, 3053 (1993) and V. Rieckert, Thesis, University of Heidelberg (1994) unpublished.
[269] G.Kramer, T.Mannel and W.F. Palmer, Z. Phys. C **55**, 497 (1992).
[270] H. Yamamoto, Harvard preprint HUTP-94/A006.
[271] H. Yamamoto, hep-ph/9402269, to appear in the Proceedings of the Snowmass conference on B physics at Hadron colliders.
[272] T. Mannel *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **259**, 359 (1991). Similar observations have been made by a large number of other authors.
[273] B. Blok and M. Shifman, Nucl. Phys. B **389**, 534 (1993).
[274] Three parameterizations of the Isgur-Wise function $\xi(vv')$ are considered: (a) $\xi(vv') = 1 + 1/4a(v-v')^2(v+v')^2$ with $a = 0.54 \pm 0.01$, (b) $\xi(vv') = 1/[1-(v-v')^2/w_0^2]$ with $w_0 = 1.12 \pm 0.17$, due to Rosner [266] , and (c) $\xi(vv') = exp[b(v-v')^2]$ with $b = 0.91 \pm 0.03$. All of these parameterizations are constrained by fitting to the average of the CLEO 1.5 and ARGUS data on $d\Gamma/dq^2(B \to D^*\ell\nu)$.
[275] C. Bernard *et al.*, "A Lattice Computation of the Decay Constants of B and D Mesons", BNL preprint 49068; C. Bernard *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **38**, 3540 (1988); G. Martinelli "Heavy Flavour on the Lattice: Results and Prospects", to appear in the proceedings of the 5th International Symposium on Heavy Flavour Physics, Montreal, 1993; M. B. Gavela *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **206**, 113 (1988); T. A. DeGrand and R. D. Loft, Phys. Rev. D **38**, 954 (1988).
[276] H. Krasemann, Phys. Lett. B **96**, 397 (1980); M. Suzuki, Phys. Lett. B **162**, 391 (1985);

S. Godfrey and N. Isgur, Phys. Rev. D **32**, 189 (1985); S. N. Sinha, Phys. Lett. B **178**, 110 (1986); P. Cea *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **206**, 691 (1988); S. Capstick and S. Godfrey, Phys. Rev. D **41**, 2856 (1988).
[277] C. Dominguez and N. Paver, Phys. Lett. B **197**, 423 (1987); S. Narison Phys. Lett. B **198**, 104 (1987); L. J. Reinders, Phys. Rev. D **38**, 947 (1988); M. A. Shifman, Usp. Fix. Nauk **151**, 193 (1987) [Sov. Phys. Usp. **30**, 91 (1987)].
[278] K. Terasaki, Phys. Rev. D **47**, 5177 (1993).
[279] The branching ratio for the modes $B \to \psi K$ and $B \to \psi K^*$ can be accommodated by the value $\xi \sim 0$ while $\xi \sim 1/3$ gives a branching ratio that is about a factor of 4 too low (see Ref. [253].
[280] A. Deandrea *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **318**, 549 (1993). The predictions of the model by Deandrea *et al.* are rescaled for our values of $V_{cb} = 0.041$, $|V_{ub}/V_{cb}| = 0.075$, $\tau_B = 1.44$ ps and for $f_{D(D^*)} = 220$ MeV.
[281] Private communication, Volker Rieckert; The result of a fit including R_4 is not significantly different. We find in this case $a_2/a_1 = 0.282 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.06$.
[282] We considered variations of f_D between 120 MeV and 320 MeV. For $f_D = 320$ MeV we find $a_2/a_1 = 0.18$.
[283] J.L. Rosner, Proceedings of TASI-90, p.91-224, Boulder, Co. 1990.
[284] V. Belyaev, A. Khodjamirian, R. Rückl, Z. Phys. C **60**, 349 (1993).
[285] P. Ball, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 3190 (1993); P. Ball, TUM-T31-39/93.
[286] A. N. Kamal and T. N. Pham, Ecole Polytechnique preprint A271.1193 .
[287] In the fits of Ref. [235] the CLEO 1.5 data favor a positive sign while the ARGUS data prefer a negative sign.
[288] I. Halperin, preprint TECHNION-PHYS-94-16, hep-ph/9411422, submitted to Physics Letters B.
[289] A. Buras, Max Planck Institute preprint MPI-PhT/94-60, TUM-T31-75/94.
[290] M. Gourdin, A.N. Kamal, Y.Y. Keum, X.Y. Pham, Phys. Lett. B **333**, 507 (1994).
[291] H.Y. Cheng, Phys. Lett. B **335**, 428 (1994). Also see H.Y. Cheng and B. Tseng, Taiwan Institute of Physics preprint IP-ASTP-21-94, hep-ph/9409408.
[292] Y.Y. Keum, PAR/LPTHE/94-40, hep-ph/9409417.
[293] M. Gronau, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 1451 (1989); Y. Nir and H.R. Quinn, "Theory of CP Violation in B decays"; I. Dunietz, "CP Violation with Additional B Decays", contributions to B Decays edited by S. Stone, World Scientific (1994).
[294] M. Gronau, J.L. Rosner, and D. London, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 21 (1994).
[295] N.G. Deshpande and X.-G. He, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 26 (1995).
[296] H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS Collaboration), DESY Preprint, DESY 93-054 (1993).
[297] J. Alexander *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), to appear in Physics Letters B.
[298] D. Choudury *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **45**, 217 (1992). The predictions have been rescaled using $|V_{ub}/V_{cb}| = 0.075$
[299] H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **241**, 278 (1990).
[300] D. Bortoletto *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 2436 (1989).
[301] H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **209**, 119 (1988).
[302] C. Bebek *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 8 (1989); K. Schubert, Proceedings of the Symposium on Heavy Quark Physics, Cornell, ed. P.S. Drell and D. Rubin, AIP, NY (1989).

[303] (DELPHI Collaboration), DELPHI 94-105 PHYS 422 paper submitted to the ICHEP94 conference in Glasgow, Scotland.
[304] R. Akers et al (OPAL Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **337**, 393 (1994).
[305] N.G. Deshpande and J. Trampetic, Phys. Rev. D **41**, 895 (1990); N.G. Deshpande, "Theory of Penguins in B Decays", contribution to B Decays ed. S.Stone, World Scientific (1994).
[306] L.L. Chau *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **43**, 2176 (1991).
[307] H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **254**, 288 (1991).
[308] P. Avery *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **223**, 470 (1990).
[309] J. Gronberg *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), CLEO CONF 94-4 submitted to the ICHEP94 conference, Glasgow, Scotland. Also see the contribution of E.H. Thorndike, to appear in the Proceedings of the Conference.
[310] The decay $\bar{B}^0 \to K^+K^-$ cannot be produced by a $b \to u$ spectator diagram or a $b \to s$ penguin transition. Thus it is expected to be small compared to $\bar{B}^0 \to \pi^+\pi^-$ and $\bar{B}^0 \to K^-\pi^+$.
[311] M. Battle *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 3922 (1993). The updated results quoted are appear in J. Gronberg *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), CLEO 94-4, paper submitted to the ICHEP94 conference, Glasgow, Scotland. For details of this analyis also see Frank Wuerthwein, Ph. D. Thesis, Cornell University, (1994), unpublished.
[312] M.G. Kendall and A. Stuart, "The Advanced Theory of Statistics", Second Edition (Hafner, New York, 1968) Vol III.
[313] J. A. Ernst, Ph. D. Thesis, University of Rochester (1995), unpublished.
[314] P. C. Kim, Proceedings of the Heavy Flavor Symposium 1993, McGill.
[315] M. S. Alam *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Cornell preprint CLNS 94/1314 (1994).
[316] R. Ammar *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 674 (1993); and Cornell Preprint CLNS 93/1212 for additional details of the likelihood analysis.
[317] M. Athanas *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), CLEO CONF 94-2, paper submitted to the ICHEP94 conference in Glasgow. Also see C.D. Jones, Ph.D. Thesis, Cornell University (1995), unpublished.
[318] A. Ali and C. Greub, Phys. Lett. B **259**, 182 (1991); A. Ali and C. Greub, Phys. Lett. B **287**, 191 (1992); A. Ali and C. Greub, Phys. Lett. B **293**, 226 (1992); A. Ali, T. Ohl and T. Mannel, Phys. Lett. B **298**, 195 (1993); A. Ali and C. Greub, DESY Preprint, DESY 93-065 (1993).
[319] S. Bertolini, F. Borzumati and A. Masiero, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 180 (1987); N.G. Deshpande *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 183 (1987); B. Grinstein, R. Springer and M.B. Wise, Phys. Lett. B **202**, 138 (1988); R. Grigjanis *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **213**, 355 (1988).
[320] N.G. Deshpande *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **214**, 467 (1988); P. Colangelo *et al.*, Z. Phys. C **45**, 575 (1990).
[321] L3 Collaboration, Phys. Lett. B **317**, 637 (1993).
[322] M. Battaglia (DELPHI Collaboration), Proceedings of the International Symposium on Heavy Flavour Physics, Montreal, 1993.
[323] T. Altomari, Phys. Rev. D **37**, 677 (1988); C.A. Dominguez *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **214**, 459 (1988); N.G. Deshpande *et al.*, Z. Phys. C **40**, 369 (1988); T.M. Aliev *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **237**, 569 (1990); P.J. O'Donnell and H. Tung, Phys. Rev. D **44**, 741 (1991).

[324] D. Atwood, B. Blok, and A. Soni, Stanford Linear Accelerator Center preprint SLAC-PUB-6635, BNL-60709, TECHNION-PH-94-11.
[325] H.Y. Cheng, Academia Sinica preprint IP-ASTP-23-94.
[326] E. Golowich and S. Pakvasa, University of Hawaii preprint UH-511-800-94, UMHEP-411, to appear in Physical Review D. E. Golowich and S. Pakvasa, paper in preparation.
[327] N. Deshpande, X.G. He, and J. Trampetic, University of Oregon preprint OTIS 564.
[328] R. Barbieri and G. Giudice, CERN Preprint CERN-TH 6830/93.
[329] For a recent review of implications of $b \to s\gamma$, see J.L. Hewett, SLAC-PUB-6521.
[330] S. Bertolini *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. B. **353**, 591 (1991); V. Barger *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1368 (1993); J. Lopez, D.V. Nanopoulos and G.T. Park, Phys. Rev. D **48**, 974 (1993); Y. Okada, Phys. Lett. B **315**, 119 (1993); R. Garisto and J.N. Ng, Phys. Lett. B **315**, 372 (1993); F. Borzumati, DESY Preprint, DESY 93-090(1993); S. Bertolini *et al.*, "Probing New Physics in FCNC B Decays and Oscillations", contribution to B Decays,ed. S.Stone, World Scientific (1994).
[331] A. Ali, G. Guidice, and T. Mannel, CERN theory preprint CERN TH.7430/94 to appear in the Proceedings of the ICHEP94 conference, Glasgow, Scotland.
[332] S.P.Chia, Phys. Lett. B **240**, 465 (1990); K.A.Peterson, Phys. Lett. B **282**, 207 (1992); T.G.Rizzo, Phys. Lett. B **315**, 471 (1993); U.Baur, S.Errede, and J. Ohnemus, Florida State University preprint FSU-HEP-930322 (1993).
[333] F.M. Borzumati, M. Drees, and M.M. Nojiri, DESY preprint 94-096, KEK-TH-400, KEK 94-44, MAD/PH/835.
[334] B. Grinstein *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. B **319**, 271 (1989); W. Jaus and D. Wyler, Phys. Rev. D **41**, 3405 (1990).; P. J. O'Donnell and H. Tung, Phys. Rev. D **43**, 2067 (1991); P. J. O'Donnell, M. Sutherland and H. Tung, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 4091 (1992);
[335] P. Colangelo *et al.*, Z. Phys. C **45**, 575 (1990). The long distance contributions are expected to be small compared to the short distance contribution for $B \to K^*\gamma$.
[336] A. Ali, T, Mannel and T. Morozumi, Phys. Lett. B **273**, 505 (1991).
[337] M.B. Cakir, Phys. Rev. D **46**, 2961 (1991).
[338] P. Avery *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **183**, 429 (1987); P. Avery *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **223**, 470 (1989).
[339] R. Balest *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), CLEO CONF 94-4, paper submitted to the ICHEP94 conference in Glasgow.
[340] H. Albrecht *et al.*(ARGUS Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **262**, 148 (1991).
[341] C. Albajar *et al.*(UA1 Collaboration), Phys. Lett. B **262**, 163 (1991).
[342] C. Amway-Wiese (CDF Collaboration), Fermilab-Conf-94/210-E to appear in the Proceedings of the 1994 DPF Conference in Alburquerque, New Mexico 1994.
[343] A. Ali, C. Greub and T. Mannel, DESY preprint DESY 93-016
[344] R. Ammar *et al.*, Cornell preprint CLNS 93/1258.
[345] A. Morsch, Proceedings of the 4th San Miniato topical Seminar on the Standard Model and just beyond (1992) P.353 (World Scientific).
[346] M. Sher and Y. Yuan, Phys. Rev. D **44**, 1461 (1991).
[347] S.Davidson, D. Bailey, and B.A. Campbell, Center for Particle Astrophysics preprint CFPA-93-TH-29(1993).
[348] H. Schröder, "$B\bar{B}$ Mixing", contribution to B Decays, ed. S. Stone, World Scientific (1994).

[349] A. Sanda, contribution to the Proceedings of the Lepton-Photon Symposium, ed. P. Drell and D. Rubin, Cornell (1993).
[350] J.P. Alexander *et al.*(CLEO Collaboration), CLEO CONF 94-5, a slightly revised version has been submitted to Physical Review Letters.
[351] G. Burdman, T. Goldman, and D. Wyler, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 111 (1995).
[352] M. Ciuchini, E. Franco, G. Martinelli, L. Reina, and L. Silvestrini, CERN preprint CERN-TH.7283/94, ROME 94/1020, ULB-TH 09/94.
[353] N.G. Deshpande and X.G. He, University of Oregon preprint OITS-538.
[354] A.J. Buras, M.E. Lautenbacher, and G. Ostermaier, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 3433 (1994).
[355] A.J. Buras, Max Planck Institute preprint, MPI-PhT/94-30, TUM-T31-64/94, hep-ph 9406272.
[356] A.J. Buras *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. **B 424**, 371 (1994).
[357] A. Ali and D. London, CERN TH.7408/94, UdeM-GPP-TH-94-07, hep-ph/9409399, to appear in the Proceedings of the ICHEP94 Conference, Glasgow, Scotland.
[358] Rosner uses a slightly different value for the SU(3) breaking parameter.
[359] P.A. Griffin, M. Masip, and M. McGuigan, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 5751 (1994).
[360] A.F. Falk, E. Jenkins, A.V. Manohar, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 4553 (1994).
[361] M. Neubert, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 4623 (1994).
[362] I.I. Bigi, M. Shifman, N. Uraltsev, A. Vainshtein, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A 9**, (1994).
[363] G.P. Korchemsky and G. Sterman, Phys. Lett. B **340**, 96 (1994).
[364] J.F. Donoghue, E. Golowich, B.R. Holstein, Cambridge University Press, 1992.

APPENDIX

Tables XXXIX and XL in the body of the paper contain the B meson branching fraction as measured by the ARGUS, CLEO 1.5 and CLEO II experiments. In this appendix we list more technical information found in the ARGUS [30] - [32], [33], [214] and CLEO [28], [232], [210], [34] publications. This includes the number of signal events and the reconstruction efficiencies. Note that different experiments used different procedures to obtain branching ratios in modes where several D or ψ decay channels were used (see Sec. II C. The information provided here will be useful to estimate the signal yields for future B experiments and also to rescale the B meson branching ratios when more precise measurements of the charmed meson branching fraction become available.

TABLE LVIII. Detailed B^- branching ratios. Experiment: ARGUS

B^- decay	Signal events	Branching ratio [%]
$B^- \to D^0\pi^-$	12 ± 5	$0.22 \pm 0.09 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.01$
$B^- \to D^0\rho^-$	19 ± 6	$1.41 \pm 0.43 \pm 0.39 \pm 0.06$
$B^- \to D^{*0}\pi^-$	9 ± 3	$0.38 \pm 0.13 \pm 0.10 \pm 0.02$
$B^- \to D^{*0}\rho^-$	7 ± 4	$0.94 \pm 0.56 \pm 0.35 \pm 0.04$
$B^- \to D_J^{(*)0}\pi^-$	6 ± 3	$0.13 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.01$
$B^- \to D^{*+}\pi^-\pi^-\pi^0$	26 ± 10	$1.64 \pm 0.64 \pm 0.37 \pm 0.07$
$B^- \to D_J^{(*)0}\rho^-$	5 ± 3	$0.32 \pm 0.19 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.01$
$B^- \to D^{*+}\pi^-\pi^-$	11 ± 6	$0.24 \pm 0.13 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.01$
$B^- \to D^0 D_s^-$	4.4 ± 2.2	$1.69 \pm 0.85 \pm 0.27 \pm 0.41$
$B^- \to D^0 D_s^{*-}$	2.3 ± 1.8	$1.13 \pm 0.85 \pm 0.20 \pm 0.27$
$B^- \to D^{*0} D_s^-$	2.0 ± 1.4	$0.79 \pm 0.55 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.19$
$B^- \to D^{*0} D_s^{*-}$	4.8 ± 2.5	$1.89 \pm 0.98 \pm 0.28 \pm 0.46$
$B^- \to \psi K^-$	6	$0.08 \pm 0.04 \pm 0.01$
$B^- \to \psi' K^-$	5	$0.20 \pm 0.09 \pm 0.04$
$B^- \to \psi K^{*-}$	2	$0.19 \pm 0.13 \pm 0.03$
$B^- \to \psi' K^{*-}$	< 3.9	< 0.53 at 90% C.L.
$B^- \to \psi K^-\pi^+\pi^-$	< 8	< 0.19 at 90% C.L.
$B^- \to \psi' K^-\pi^+\pi^-$	3	$0.21 \pm 0.12 \pm 0.04$
$B^- \to \chi_{c1} K^-$	4 ± 2.0	$0.22 \pm 0.15 \pm 0.07$

TABLE LIX. Detailed $\bar{B}^0$ branching ratios. Experiment: ARGUS

$\bar{B}^0$ decay	Signal events	Branching ratio [%]
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\pi^-$	22 ± 5	$0.48 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.03$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\rho^-$	9 ± 5	$0.90 \pm 0.50 \pm 0.27 \pm 0.06$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^-$	12 ± 4	$0.25 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.01$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\rho^-$	19 ± 9	$0.64 \pm 0.27 \pm 0.25 \pm 0.03$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^-\pi^-\pi^+$	26 ± 7	$1.09 \pm 0.27 \pm 0.32 \pm 0.04$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^+ D_s^-$	2.4 ± 1.8	$1.05 \pm 0.80 \pm 0.35 \pm 0.26$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^+ D_s^{*-}$	3.2 ± 2.0	$1.67 \pm 1.05 \pm 0.52 \pm 0.41$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+} D_s^-$	2.6 ± 1.8	$0.83 \pm 0.59 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.20$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+} D_s^{*-}$	3.9 ± 2.0	$1.54 \pm 0.83 \pm 0.24 \pm 0.37$
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi K^0$	2	$0.09 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.02$
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi' K^0$	< 2.3	< 0.30 at 90% C.L.
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi \bar{K}^{*0}$	6	$0.13 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.02$
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi' \bar{K}^{*0}$	< 3.9	< 0.25 at 90% C.L.
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi' K^-\pi^+$	< 2.3	< 0.11 at 90% C.L.

TABLE LX. Detailed B^- branching ratios. Experiment: CLEO 1.5

B^- decay	Signature	Signal	Eff.	BR [%]	Branching ratio [%]
$B^- \to D^0\pi^-$					$0.56 \pm 0.08 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.02$
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$	19 ± 5	0.42	0.50 ± 0.12	
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-$	25 ± 6	0.27	0.50 ± 0.10	
	$D^0 \to \bar{K}^0\pi^+\pi^-$	10 ± 4	0.05	1.51 ± 0.63	
$B^- \to D^0\pi^+\pi^-\pi^-$					$1.24 \pm 0.31 \pm 0.14 \pm 0.05$
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$	34 ± 8	0.32	1.24 ± 0.31	
$B^- \to D^{*0}\pi^-$					$1.00 \pm 0.25 \pm 0.18 \pm 0.04$
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$	9 ± 3	0.13	0.97 ± 0.35	
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-$	12 ± 4	0.08	0.95 ± 0.36	
$B^- \to D_J^{(*)0}\pi^-$					$0.13 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.01 \pm 0.01$
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$	2.2 ± 1.5	0.22	0.15 ± 0.10	
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-$	1.8 ± 1.5	0.13	0.12 ± 0.09	
$B^- \to D^{*+}\pi^-\pi^-$					< 0.37
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$	< 8	0.22	< 0.54	
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-$	< 3.5	0.11	< 0.24	
$B^- \to D^0 D_s^-$					$1.66 \pm 0.70 \pm 0.13 \pm 0.40$
		5.0 ± 2.2	0.07	1.66 ± 0.70	
$B^- \to \psi K^-$					$0.09 \pm 0.02 \pm 0.02$
	$\psi \to \mu^+\mu^-, e^+e^-$	11 ± 3	0.41	0.09 ± 0.02	
$B^- \to \psi' K^-$					< 0.05
	$\psi' \to \mu^+\mu^-, e^+e^-$	< 2.3	0.53	< 0.10	
	$\psi' \to \psi\pi^+\pi^-$	< 2.3	0.23	< 0.11	
$B^- \to \psi K^{*-}$					$0.15 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.03$
	$\psi \to \mu^+\mu^-, e^+e^-$	2 ± 1	0.05	0.15 ± 0.11	
$B^- \to \psi' K^{*-}$					< 0.38
	$\psi' \to \mu^+\mu^-, e^+e^-$	< 2.3	0.08	< 0.70	
	$\psi' \to \psi\pi^+\pi^-$	< 2.3	0.03	< 0.82	
$B^- \to \psi K^-\pi^+\pi^-$					$0.14 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.03$
	$\psi \to \mu^+\mu^-, e^+e^-$	6 ± 3	0.14	0.14 ± 0.07	

TABLE LXI. Detailed $\bar{B}^0$ branching ratios. Experiment: CLEO 1.5

$\bar{B}^0$ decay	Signature	Signal	Eff.	BR [%]	Branching ratio [%]
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\pi^-$					$0.27 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.02$
	$D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+$	17 ± 4	0.33	0.23 ± 0.06	
	$D^+ \to \bar{K}^0\pi^+$	4 ± 2	0.09	0.66 ± 0.36	
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\pi^-\pi^-\pi^+$					$0.81 \pm 0.21 \pm 0.09 \pm 0.05$
	$D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+$	27 ± 9	0.22	0.40 ± 0.19	
	$D^+ \to \bar{K}^0\pi^+$	11 ± 4	0.06	3.20 ± 1.19	
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^-$					$0.45 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.02$
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$	8 ± 3	0.34	0.36 ± 0.14	
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-$	9 ± 3	0.19	0.39 ± 0.13	
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\rho^-$					$2.13 \pm 0.90 \pm 1.24 \pm 0.09$
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$	2 ± 1	0.02	1.35 ± 0.90	
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-$	4 ± 2	0.02	1.93 ± 0.96	
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^-\pi^-\pi^+$					$1.77 \pm 0.31 \pm 0.30 \pm 0.07$
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$	18 ± 4	0.15	0.17 ± 0.05	
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-$	18 ± 5	0.08	1.83 ± 0.58	
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^+D_s^-$					$0.54 \pm 0.31 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.13$
		3.0 ± 1.7	0.10	0.65 ± 0.36	
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}D_s^-$					$1.17 \pm 0.66 \pm 0.09 \pm 0.28$
		3.0 ± 1.7	0.05	1.17 ± 0.56	
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi K^0$					$0.07 \pm 0.04 \pm 0.02$
	$\psi \to \mu^+\mu^-, e^+e^-$	3 ± 2	0.15	0.07 ± 0.04	
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi' K^0$					< 0.16
	$\psi' \to \mu^+\mu^-, e^+e^-$	< 2.3	0.18	< 0.30	
	$\psi' \to \psi\pi^+\pi^-$	< 2.3	0.07	< 0.35	
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi \bar{K}^{*0}$					$0.13 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.03$
	$\psi \to \mu^+\mu^-, e^+e^-$	7 ± 3	0.21	0.13 ± 0.06	
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi' \bar{K}^{*0}$					$0.15 \pm 0.09 \pm 0.03$
	$\psi' \to \mu^+\mu^-, e^+e^-$	2 ± 1	0.25	0.19 ± 0.13	
	$\psi' \to \psi\pi^+\pi^-$	1 ± 1	0.10	0.11 ± 0.11	
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi K^-\pi^+$					$0.12 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.03$
	$\psi \to \mu^+\mu^-, e^+e^-$	7 ± 3	0.19	0.12 ± 0.05	

TABLE LXII. Detailed B^- branching ratios. Experiment: CLEO II

B^- decay	Signature	Signal	Eff.	BR [%]	Branching ratio [%]
$B^- \to D^0\pi^-$					$0.53 \pm 0.04 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.02$
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$	76.3 ± 9.1	0.43	0.48 ± 0.06	
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^0$	134 ± 15	0.19	0.63 ± 0.07	
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-$	94 ± 11	0.22	0.51 ± 0.06	
$B^- \to D^0\rho^-$					$1.31 \pm 0.12 \pm 0.14 \pm 0.04$
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$	80 ± 9	0.16	1.40 ± 0.18	
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^0$	42 ± 9	0.04	1.05 ± 0.23	
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-$	90.4 ± 12.1	0.08	1.38 ± 0.18	
$B^- \to D^{*0}\pi^-$					$0.49 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.06 \pm 0.00$
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$	13.3 ± 3.8	0.16	0.36 ± 0.13	
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^0$	37.7 ± 6.9	0.08	0.64 ± 0.12	
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-$	20.0 ± 4.9	0.08	0.47 ± 0.12	
$B^- \to D^{*0}\rho^-$					$1.59 \pm 0.20 \pm 0.26 \pm 0.05$
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$	25.7 ± 5.4	0.06	1.74 ± 0.37	
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^0$	43.8 ± 7.8	0.03	2.27 ± 0.41	
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-$	16.9 ± 4.6	0.03	1.07 ± 0.32	
$B^- \to D^{*0}\pi^-\pi^-\pi^+$					$0.92 \pm 0.20 \pm 0.17 \pm 0.01$
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$	5.5 ± 2.9	0.05	0.51 ± 0.26	
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^0$	27.7 ± 7.2	0.02	1.76 ± 0.46	
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-$	15 ± 5	0.03	1.14 ± 0.33	
$B^- \to D^{*0}a_1^-$					$1.83 \pm 0.39 \pm 0.33 \pm 0.02$
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$	5.5 ± 2.9	0.05	1.02 ± 0.52	
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^0$	27.7 ± 7.2	0.02	3.46 ± 0.91	
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-$	15 ± 5	0.03	2.28 ± 0.67	
$B^- \to D^+\pi^-\pi^-$					< 0.14
	$D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+$	< 10.3	0.11	< 0.14	
$B^- \to D^{*+}\pi^-\pi^-$		14.1 ± 5.4			$0.18 \pm 0.07 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.01$
$B^- \to D^{**0}(2420)\pi^-$					$0.11 \pm 0.05 \pm 0.02 \pm 0.01$
	$D^{**0} \to D^{*+}\pi^-$	8.5 ± 3.8		0.11 ± 0.05	
$B^- \to D^{**0}(2420)\rho^-$					< 0.13
	$D^{**0} \to D^{*+}\rho^-$	3.4 ± 2.1		< 0.13	
$B^- \to D^{**0}(2460)\pi^-$					< 0.13
	$D^{**0} \to D^{*+}\pi^-$	3.5 ± 2.3		< 0.27	
	$D^{**0} \to D^+\pi^-$	< 5.6	0.21	< 0.13	
$B^- \to D^{**0}(2460)\rho^-$					< 0.45
	$D^{**0} \to D^{*+}\pi^-$	3.2 ± 2.4		< 0.48	
	$D^{**0} \to D^+\pi^-$	< 6.1	0.08	< 0.45	
$B^- \to D^0 D_s^-$		58.4 ± 10.0	2.00×10^{-3}	(ϵBR)	$1.11 \pm 0.20 \pm 0.23 \pm 0.28$
$B^- \to D^0 D_s^{*-}$		16.1 ± 5.0	0.83×10^{-3}	(ϵBR)	$0.79 \pm 0.25 \pm 0.15 \pm 0.19$
$B^- \to D^{*0} D_s^-$		13.5 ± 4.1	0.43×10^{-3}	(ϵBR)	$1.27 \pm 0.39 \pm 0.32 \pm 0.31$
$B^- \to D^{*0} D_s^{*-}$		14.9 ± 4.2	0.21×10^{-3}	(ϵBR)	$2.82 \pm 0.80 \pm 0.59 \pm 0.68$

TABLE LXIII. Detailed B^- branching ratios. Experiment: CLEO II

B^- decay	Signature	Signal	Eff.	BR [%]	Branching ratio [%]
$B^- \to \psi K^-$					$0.110 \pm 0.015 \pm 0.009$
	$\psi \to \mu^+\mu^-, e^+e^-$	58.7 ± 7.9	0.47	0.11 ± 0.01	
$B^- \to \psi' K^-$		7.0 ± 2.6			$0.061 \pm 0.023 \pm 0.009$
$B^- \to \psi K^{*-}$					$0.178 \pm 0.051 \pm 0.023$
	$K^{*-} \to K^-\pi^0$	6.0 ± 2.4	0.07	0.22 ± 0.09	
	$K^{*-} \to K_s\pi^-$	6.6 ± 2.7	0.17	0.13 ± 0.06	
$B^- \to \psi' K^{*-}$					< 0.30
	$K^{*-} \to K^-\pi^0$	1 ± 1		< 0.56	
	$K^{*-} \to K_s\pi^-$	1 ± 1		< 0.36	
$B^- \to \chi_{c1} K^-$					$0.097 \pm 0.040 \pm 0.009$
	$\chi_{c1} \to \gamma\psi$	6.0 ± 2.4	0.20	0.10 ± 0.04	
$B^- \to \chi_{c1} K^{*-}$					< 0.21
	$K^{*-} \to K^-\pi^0$	0	0.03	< 0.67	
	$K^{*-} \to K_s\pi^-$	0	0.11	< 0.30	
$B^- \to \psi\pi^-$					$0.005 \pm 0.002 \pm 0.000$
	$\psi \to \mu^+\mu^-, e^+e^-$	5 ± 1	0.33	0.005 ± 0.002	

TABLE LXIV. Detailed $\bar{B}^0$ branching ratios. Experiment: CLEO II

$\bar{B}^0$ decay	Signature	Signal	Eff.	BR [%]	Branching ratio [%]
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\pi^-$					$0.29 \pm 0.04 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.02$
	$D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+$	80.6 ± 9.8	0.32	0.29 ± 0.04	
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^+\rho^-$					$0.81 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.12 \pm 0.05$
	$D^+ \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+$	78.9 ± 10.7	0.12	0.81 ± 0.11	
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^-$					$0.25 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.04 \pm 0.01$
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$	19.4 ± 4.5	0.35	0.22 ± 0.05	
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^0$	31.9 ± 6.4	0.14	0.30 ± 0.06	
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-$	20.5 ± 5.2	0.15	0.24 ± 0.06	
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\rho^-$					$0.70 \pm 0.09 \pm 0.13 \pm 0.02$
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$	21.9 ± 5.2	0.12	0.71 ± 0.17	
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^0$	39.8 ± 7.2	0.05	1.09 ± 0.20	
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-$	14.6 ± 4.6	0.05	0.47 ± 0.15	
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^-\pi^-\pi^+$					$0.61 \pm 0.10 \pm 0.11 \pm 0.02$
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$	13.5 ± 3.9	0.10	0.58 ± 0.17	
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^0$	21.7 ± 5.9	0.04	0.68 ± 0.18	
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-$	13.9 ± 4.4	0.04	0.59 ± 0.17	
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}a_1^-$					$1.22 \pm 0.19 \pm 0.22 \pm 0.04$
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$	13.5 ± 3.9	0.10	1.16 ± 0.34	
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^0$	21.7 ± 5.9	0.04	1.36 ± 0.36	
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+\pi^+\pi^-$	13.9 ± 2.4	0.04	1.17 ± 0.34	
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^0\pi^+\pi^-$					< 0.16
	$D^0 \to K^-\pi^+$	< 10.1	0.19	< 0.16	
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{**+}(2460)\pi^-$					< 0.21
	$D^{**+} \to D^0\pi^+$	< 5.6	0.26	< 0.21	
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{**+}(2460)\rho^-$					< 0.47
	$D^{**+} \to D^0\pi^+$	< 5.1	0.11	< 0.47	
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^+D_s^-$		19.7 ± 5.5	1.03×10^{-3}	(ϵBR)	$0.82 \pm 0.23 \pm 0.19 \pm 0.20$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^+D_s^{*-}$		10.3 ± 3.6	0.47×10^{-3}	(ϵBR)	$0.95 \pm 0.33 \pm 0.21 \pm 0.23$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}D_s^-$		18.4 ± 4.5	0.87×10^{-3}	(ϵBR)	$0.85 \pm 0.21 \pm 0.15 \pm 0.21$
$\bar{B}^0 \to D^{*+}D_s^{*-}$		17.7 ± 4.4	0.38×10^{-3}	(ϵBR)	$1.85 \pm 0.46 \pm 0.33 \pm 0.45$

TABLE LXV. Detailed $\bar{B}^0$ branching ratios. Experiment: CLEO II

$\bar{B}^0$ decay	Signature	Signal	Eff.	BR [%]	Branching ratio [%]
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi K^0$					$0.075 \pm 0.024 \pm 0.008$
	$\psi \to \mu^+\mu^-, e^+e^-$	10.0 ± 3.2	0.34	0.08 ± 0.02	
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi' K^0$		0			< 0.08
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi \bar{K}^{*0}$					$0.169 \pm 0.031 \pm 0.018$
	$\psi \to \mu^+\mu^-, e^+e^-$	29.0 ± 5.4	0.23	0.17 ± 0.03	
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi' \bar{K}^{*0}$		4.2 ± 2.3			< 0.19
$\bar{B}^0 \to \chi_{c1} K^0$					< 0.27
	$\chi_{c1} \to \gamma\psi$	1 ± 1	0.14	< 0.27	
$\bar{B}^0 \to \chi_{c1} \bar{K}^{*0}$					< 0.21
	$\chi_{c1} \to \gamma\psi$	1.2 ± 1.5	0.13	< 0.21	
$\bar{B}^0 \to \psi\pi^0$					< 0.0069
	$\psi \to \mu^+\mu^-, e^+e^-$	1 ± 1	0.22	< 0.01	